Property of
CBDP

Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

Frederick Grant
1930

Property of
CBDP
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/documentsonchris00unse

DOCUMENTS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

SECOND SERIES

DOCUMENTS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

SECOND SERIES

EDITED BY

G. K. A. BELL

BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD

BX
8
A1D6
1924
V.2

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW
LEIPZIG NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY
CALCUTTA MADRAS SHANGHAI
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE
UNIVERSITY

Printed in Great Britain

PREFACE TO THE SECOND SERIES

A GREAT deal has happened in the field of Christian Unity since this work was first published in 1924. The new series includes fifty-four fresh Documents and adds another chapter to the story of the movement for the Reunion of Christendom. The whole collection is indeed both a text-book and a chronicle covering ten remarkable years, which begin with the Sixth Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in 1920 and close with the summoning of the Seventh in July 1930.

A glance at the Table of Contents will show the variety and the importance of the conferences which have been held, and of the proposals which have been under consideration in many Christian communions. In certain cases union has been definitely achieved since 1924. Thus the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches in Canada are now the United Church of Canada. On October 2, 1929, the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland from being twain became one Church of Scotland. The ten years have also been notable for the assembling of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm in 1925, the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927, and the International Missionary Council in Jerusalem in 1928. Nor must we fail to mention the series of important conversations at Malines between Roman Catholic and Anglican divines under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier, 1921–5, with the 'friendly cognizance' of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and 'blessed and encouraged' by the Pope (*Documents*, pp. 345 and 353): conversations which had no mandate to negotiate as for a union, but aimed at a *rapprochement*. There were also the joint conferences, which began in 1921, between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal communions

18838

'upon the whole subject of the Lambeth Appeal', which were suspended in 1925 in order that the provisional conclusions so far reached might be more fully considered by the members of the denominations concerned, at home and overseas. All the principal Documents will be found in the pages which follow; and other Documents as well relating to the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Old Catholics, the Moravians, and the individual non-Episcopal denominations in England.

Finally, in South India the movement for church unity which began in a very unofficial way in 1919 has now reached a stage of crucial importance: and this second series contains not only the Proposed Scheme of Union, but the Resolutions which have been adopted with regard to it by the official Assemblies or Councils of the three negotiating communions, the South India United Church, the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon.

It only remains for the Editor to offer his best thanks to all those who have given permission to reprint various Documents in this book, or have helped him in other ways. Archbishop Davidson, with whom so many of these pages are associated, has entered into his rest (May 25, 1930): but his work remains to our unceasing gratitude. For leave to reprint the Documents relating to the World Conference on Faith and Order I wish to thank the Secretaries, the Student Christian Movement, and especially the Very Rev. H. N. Bate, Dean of Bocking, who edited the Official Report. I wish to thank the Warden of Keble, Dr. B. J. Kidd, and the Oxford University Press for leave to print the series of important extracts from *The Conversations at Malines*; and I am very grateful to the late Archbishop Lord Davidson for allowing me to print for the first time his Letter to the Dean of Wells which deals with certain matters

under discussion at Malines. I offer warm thanks to His Eminence Cardinal Bourne for permitting me to print the translation into English of the Encyclical *Mortalium Animos* contributed with an article by himself to *The Reunion of Christendom*, and to Messrs. Cassell the publishers. I would here take the opportunity of stating that the Cardinal was one of the first to thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for the official copy of the Appeal to all Christian People which was sent to him, as also to the representatives of other Christian communions, acknowledging its receipt in a letter dated August 14, 1920. Once again I owe many thanks to the Rev. W. L. Robertson, D.D., Secretary of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, for help with the Documents relating to the Joint Conferences at Lambeth and to the non-Episcopal churches; as also to the authorities of the different churches. To the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop Mumford I am very grateful for permission to publish the important correspondence between the Archbishop's Committee and the Moravian Committee. Finally, I acknowledge the kindness of the S.P.C.K. and its Editorial Secretary, the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., in permitting me to print the Proposed Scheme of Union (South India); and the very ready help given in obtaining the most recent documents relating to the South India proposals by the Metropolitan of India and Bishop Palmer, the Rev. J. J. Banninga, D.D., Secretary of the General Assembly of the South India United Church, and the Rev. J. S. M. Hooper, M.A., Chairman of the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. There are many others to whose help in different ways this collection owes much; and I trust that those whom I do not here name will accept this general and sincere expression of my gratitude.

Whitsuntide 1930. GEORGE CICESTR:

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER.

91. Preamble. Unanimously adopted by the full Conference. August 1927 1
92. The Call to Unity. Unanimously adopted by the full Conference. August 1927 2
93. The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel. Report of Section II received by the full Conference, *nem. con.* August 1927 3
94. The Nature of the Church. Report of Section III received by the full Conference, *nem. con.* August 1927 5
95. The Church's Common Confession of Faith. Report of Section IV received by the full Conference, *nem. con.* August 1927 8
96. The Ministry of the Church. Report of Section V received by the full Conference, *nem. con.* August 1927 9
97. The Sacraments. Report of Section VI received by the full Conference, *nem. con.* August 1927 . . 13
98. Foreword to the Report on Subject VII. . . 15
99. The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of existing Churches. Report on Subject VII presented with amendments to the Business Committee, and submitted to the Churches. December 1927 17
100. Concluding Statement. Drafted by the Chairman of the Conference at its request. August 1927 . . 23
101. Declaration on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Read in English by Archbishop Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira, to the full session of the World Conference, prior to the discussion of Reports VI and VII. August 18, 1927 . 25
102. The Continuation Committee of the World Conference. Resolution adopted at Maloja. August 1929 . 30

II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

(Conversations at Malines, 1921–5.)

103. Statement by the Anglican Group on the Position of St. Peter. November 1923. 32
104. Statement by the Roman Catholic Group on the Position of St. Peter. November 1923 . . 35
105. An Anglican Memorandum on the Petrine texts as employed to A.D. 461. November 1923 . . 36
106. Statement by the Anglican Group on some considerations following on the discussion about relations between the Pope and the Bishops. May 1925 . 36

PAGE

107. A Summary of the Conversations 37
108. The Roman Catholic Account of Points of Agreement with regard to the Sacraments 39
109. The Roman Catholic Account of Points of Agreement with regard to the Pope 42
110. A Suggested Basis for Practical Action. March 1923 43
111. A Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Dean of Wells. March 1923 45

(Pronouncements from Rome)

112. Question concerning Conferences (as is alleged) to promote the Unity of all Christian People. August 1927 50
113. Encyclical Letter (*Mortalium Animos*) of His Holiness Pope Pius XI on fostering True Religious Union. January 6, 1928 51

III. THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES.

114. Anglican Ordinations. Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Archbishop of Utrecht. June 1925 64
115. Anglican Ordinations. Letter to the Archbishop of Utrecht from the Archbishop of Canterbury. July 1925 65
116. Anglican Ordinations. Statement by the Conference of Old Catholic Bishops assembled at Berne. September 1925 66
117. Relations with the Church of England. Resolutions of the Tenth International Congress of Old Catholics. Berne, September 1925 66

IV. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE FREE CHURCHES.

(Further proceedings of the Joint Conference held at Lambeth Palace, 1921–5.)

118. A Memorandum on A Constitutional Episcopate. Adopted by the Joint Conference. July 11, 1924 . 68
119. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. Resolution adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 16, 1924 72
120. A Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. June 19, 1925 73
121. A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry. Presented on behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference, together with an Appended Note from the Free Church Members of the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 77

PAGE

122. A Memorandum by the Bishop of Truro and the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., with reference to the question, 'What is meant by a Representative and Constitutional Episcopate, and how the Elements of Presbyteral and Congregational Order may be combined with it?' Generally approved by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 . . . 87
123. A Short Memorandum on the Relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in Fellowship in other parts of the World. Adopted by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 . . 94
124. A Short Memorandum on the Problems connected with the Union between Church and State. Adopted by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 . . 95
125. A Short Memorandum on the Safeguarding of the Evangelical Principles of the Reformation. Adopted by the Joint Conference. June 19, 1925 97
126. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly. September 21–3, 1925 . . 98

FURTHER RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL ADOPTED BY THE FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLIES.

127. The Baptist Union. Resolution of the Annual Assembly. May 4, 1926 102
128. The Presbyterian Church of England. Resolution of the General Assembly. May 5, 1926 . . . 107
129. The Primitive Methodist Church. Reply of the Annual Conference. June 1926 108
130. The United Methodist Church. Resolution of the Annual Conference. July 1926 110
131. The Congregational Union. Reply of the Annual Assembly. May 11, 1927 113

V. THE MORAVIAN CHURCH (*UNITAS FRATRUM*).

132. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee on certain points raised by the Lambeth Resolutions 1920. December 31, 1920 117
133. Reply of the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. May 2, 1921 122
134. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee to the Archbishop's Committee. June 1922 . . 125
135. A Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to the Moravian Committee. December 12, 1922 . . 128
136. Reply of the Moravian Committee to the Archbishop's Committee's letter. 134
137. Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to the Moravian Committee. November 26, 1923 . . 138
138. Final Letter from the Moravian Committee to the Archbishop's Committee. March 31, 1924 . . 139

PAGE

VI. SOUTH INDIA.

139. Proposed Scheme of Union prepared by the Joint Committee of the South India United Church, the Episcopal Synod of the Province of India, Burma, and Ceylon, and the Wesleyan Conference. March 1929 143

140. The South India United Church. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. October 1929 . . 191

141. The South India United Church. Report of the Special Committee on Church Union. Presented to the General Assembly. October 1929 . . 194

142. The South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. January 1930 . . . 206

143. The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. Resolutions adopted by the General Council. February 1930. 210

VII. THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK.

144. The Message of the Conference. Stockholm, August 1925 220

I. THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

[The World Conference was held at Lausanne, August 3–21, 1927. About 500 delegates were present and nearly all the Christian Communions, except the Roman Catholic Church, were represented. The President was the Rt. Rev. C. H. Brent, D.D.; the Deputy-Chairman, the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D.; and the General Secretary, Mr. R. W. Brown. At the close of the Conference a Continuation Committee was appointed which met at Prague in 1928, and at Maloja in 1929. The Documents which follow are: (1) The Reports of the Conference as a whole, which were ordered to be sent to all the Churches represented for their consideration and report to the Continuation Committee which would later 'consider what steps need to be taken for another Conference'; (2) An independent Declaration made by the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church; (3) A Resolution adopted by the Continuation Committee in 1929.]

91. *Preamble*

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE AUGUST 20, 1927

WE, representatives of many Christian Communions throughout the world, united in the common confession of faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God, our Lord and Saviour, believing that the Spirit of God is with us, are assembled to consider the things wherein we agree and the things wherein we differ. We now receive the following series of reports as containing subject matter for the consideration of our respective Churches in their common search for unity.

This is a Conference summoned to consider matters of Faith and Order. It is emphatically *not* attempting to define the conditions of future reunion. Its object is to register the apparent level of fundamental agreements within the Conference and the grave points of disagreements remaining; also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement.

Each subject on the agenda was first discussed in plenary session. It was then committed to one of the sections, of more than one hundred members each, into which the whole Conference was divided. The report, after full discussion in subsections, was finally drawn up and adopted unanimously or by a large majority vote by the section to which it had been committed. It was twice presented for further discussion to a plenary session of the Conference when it was referred to the Churches in its present form.

Though we recognize the reports to be neither exhaustive nor in all details satisfactory to every member of the Conference, we submit them to the Churches for that deliberate consideration which could not be given in the brief period of our session. We thank God and rejoice over agreements reached; upon our agreements we build. Where the reports record differences, we call upon the Christian world to an earnest reconsideration of the conflicting opinions now held, and a strenuous endeavour to reach the truth as it is in God's mind, which should be the foundation of the Church's unity.

92. The Call to Unity

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE
AUGUST 20, 1927

God wills unity. Our presence in this Conference bears testimony to our desire to bend our wills to His. However we may justify the beginnings of disunion, we lament its continuance and henceforth must labour, in penitence and faith, to build up our broken walls.

God's Spirit has been in the midst of us. It was He who called us hither. His presence has been manifest in our worship, our deliberations and our whole fellowship. He has discovered us to one another. He has enlarged our horizons, quickened our understanding, and enlivened our hope. We have dared and God has justified our daring. We can never

be the same again. Our deep thankfulness must find expression in sustained endeavour to share the visions vouchsafed us here with those smaller home groups where our lot is cast.

More than half the world is waiting for the Gospel. At home and abroad sad multitudes are turning away in bewilderment from the Church because of its corporate feebleness. Our missions count that as a necessity which we are inclined to look on as a luxury. Already the mission field is impatiently revolting from the divisions of the Western Church to make bold adventure for unity in its own right. We of the Churches represented in this Conference cannot allow our spiritual children to outpace us. We with them must gird ourselves to the task, the early beginnings of which God has so richly blessed, and labour side by side until our common goal is reached.

Some of us, pioneers in this undertaking, have grown old in our search for unity. It is to youth that we look to lift the torch on high. We men have carried it too much alone through many years. The women henceforth should be accorded their share of responsibility. And so the whole Church will be enabled to do that which no section can hope to perform.

It was God's clear call that gathered us. With faith stimulated by His guidance to us here, we move forward.

93. The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel

Report of Section II
Received by the full Conference, *nem. con.*
August 19, 1927

The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's Spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament; and in the fullness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the son of God and the son of Man, full of grace and truth.

Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgement, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fullness of the living God, and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord, is also the centre of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer, and of praise.

The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound, it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service, and compassionate love. It

offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth, strength to the toiler, rest to the weary, and the crown of life to the martyr.

The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men 'Come unto me! ... He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life'.

94. *The Nature of the Church*

REPORT OF SECTION III
RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE *nem. con.*
AUGUST 19, 1927

God, who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world, has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. The Church of the Living God is constituted by His own will, not by the will or consent or beliefs of men whether as individuals or as societies, though He uses the will of men as His instrument. Of this Church Jesus Christ is the Head, the Holy Spirit its continuing life.

The Church as the communion of believers in Christ Jesus is, according to the New Testament, the people of the New Covenant; the Body of Christ; and the Temple of God, built

upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.

The Church is God's chosen instrument by which Christ, through the Holy Spirit, reconciles men to God through faith, bringing their wills into subjection to His sovereignty, sanctifying them through the means of grace, and uniting them in love and service to be His witnesses and fellow-workers in the extension of His rule on earth until His Kingdom come in glory.

As there is but one Christ, and one life in Him, and one Holy Spirit who guides into all truth, so there is and can be but one Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

The Church on earth possesses certain characteristics whereby it can be known of men. These have been, since the days of the Apostles, at least the following:

1. The possession and acknowledgement of the Word of God as given in Holy Scripture and interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the Church and to the individual. ([a])
2. The profession of faith in God as He is incarnate and revealed in Christ.
3. The acceptance of Christ's commission to preach the Gospel to every creature.
4. The observance of the Sacraments.
5. A ministry for the pastoral office, the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the Sacraments.
6. A fellowship in prayer, in worship, in all the means of grace, in the pursuit of holiness, and in the service of man.

As to the extent and manner in which the Church thus described finds expression in the existing Churches, we differ. Our differences chiefly concern:

1. The nature of the Church visible and the Church invisible, their relation to each other, and the number of those who are included in each. ([b])
2. The significance of our divisions past and present. ([c])

Whatever our views on these points, we are convinced that it is the will of Christ that the one life of the one body should be manifest to the world. To commend the Gospel to doubting, sinful, and bewildered men, a united witness is necessary. We therefore urge most earnestly that all Christians, in fulfilment of our Saviour's prayer that His disciples may be one, reconsecrate themselves to God, that by the help of His Spirit the body of Christ may be built up, its members united in faith and love, and existing obstacles to the manifestation of their unity in Christ may be removed; that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him.

We join in the prayer that the time may be hastened when in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

NOTES

(a) Some hold that this interpretation is given through the tradition of the Church; others through the immediate witness of the Spirit to the heart and conscience of believers; others through both combined.

(b) For instance

1. Some hold that the invisible Church is wholly in heaven; others include in it all true believers on earth, whether contained in any organization or not.
2. Some hold that the visible expression of the Church was determined by Christ Himself and is therefore unchangeable; others that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms.
3. Some hold that one or other of the existing Churches is the only true Church; others that the Church as we have described it is to be found in some or all of the existing communions taken together.
4. Some, while recognizing other Christian bodies as Churches, are persuaded that in the providence of God and by the teaching of history a particular form of ministry has been shown to be necessary to the best welfare of the Church; others hold that no one form of organization is inherently preferable; still others, that no organization is necessary.

(c) One view is that no division of Christendom has ever come to pass without sin. Another view is that the divisions were the

inevitable outcome of different gifts of the Spirit and different understandings of the truth. Between these, there is the view of those who look back on the divisions of the past with penitence and sorrow coupled with a lively sense of God's mercy, which in spite of and even through these divisions has advanced His cause in the world.

95. *The Church's Common Confession of Faith*

REPORT OF SECTION IV

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 19, 1927

We members of the Conference on Faith and Order, coming from all parts of the world in the interest of Christian unity, have with deep gratitude to God found ourselves united in common prayer, in God our heavenly Father and His Son Jesus Christ, our Saviour, in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

Notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Oecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ.

We believe that the Holy Spirit in leading the Church into all truth may enable it, while firmly adhering to the witness of these Creeds (our common heritage from the ancient Church), to express the truths of revelation in such other forms as new problems may from time to time demand.

Finally, we desire to leave on record our solemn and unanimous testimony that no external and written standards can suffice without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ.

NOTES

1. It must be noted that the Orthodox Eastern Church can accept the Nicene Creed only in its uninterpolated form without the *filioque* clause; and that although the Apostles' Creed has no place in the formularies of this Church, it is in accordance with its teaching.

2. It must be noted also that some of the Churches represented

in this Conference conjoin tradition with the Scriptures, some are explicit in subordinating Creeds to the Scriptures, some attach a primary importance to their particular Confessions, and some make no use of Creeds.

3. It is understood that the use of these Creeds will be determined by the competent authority in each Church, and that the several Churches will continue to make use of such special Confessions as they possess.

96. *The Ministry of the Church*

REPORT OF SECTION V

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 20, 1927

We members of the Conference on Faith and Order are happy to report that we find ourselves in substantial accord in the following five propositions:

1. The ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church.

2. The ministry is perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit.

3. The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments, to be made effective by faith.

4. The ministry is entrusted with the government and discipline of the Church, in whole or in part.

5. Men gifted for the work of the ministry, called by the Spirit and accepted by the Church, are commissioned through an act of ordination by prayer and the laying on of hands to exercise the function of this ministry.

Within the many Christian communions into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of the several communions and their beliefs as to the mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These communions have been, in God's providence, mani-

festly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints. But the differences which have arisen in regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have been and are the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings.

These differences concern the nature of the ministry (whether consisting of one or several orders), the nature of ordination and of the grace conferred thereby, the function and authority of Bishops, and the nature of Apostolic succession. We believe that the first step toward the overcoming of these difficulties is the frank recognition that they exist, and the clear definition of their nature. We therefore add as an appendix to our Report such a statement, commending it to the thoughtful consideration of the Churches we represent.

By these differences the difficulties of inter-communion have been accentuated to the distress and wounding of faithful souls, while in the mission field, where the Church is fulfilling its primary object to preach the Gospel to every creature, the young Churches find the lack of unity a very serious obstacle to the furtherance of the Gospel. Consequently the provision of a ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing the sanction of the whole Church is an urgent need.

There has not been time in this Conference to consider all the points of difference between us in the matter of the ministry with that care and patience which could alone lead to complete agreement. The same observation applies equally to proposals for the constitution of the united Church. Certain suggestions as to possible church organization have been made, which we transmit to the Churches with the earnest hope that common study of these questions will be continued by the members of the various Churches represented in this Conference.

In view of (1) the place which the Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters, and the Congregation of the faithful, respectively, had in the constitution of the early Church, and (2) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems of government are each to-day, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendom, and (3) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church, we therefore recognize that these several elements must all, under conditions which require further study, have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church, and that each separate communion, recalling the abundant blessing of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past, should gladly bring to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures.

If the foregoing suggestion be accepted and acted upon, it is essential that the acceptance of any special form of ordination as the regular and orderly method of introduction into the ministry of the Church for the future should not be interpreted to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory of the origin, character or function of any office in the Church, or to involve the acceptance of any adverse judgement on the validity of ordination in those branches of the Church universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic Orders under other forms of ordination; or as disowning or discrediting a past or present ministry of the Word and Sacrament which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

It is further recognized that inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon every believer, and each believer has an immediate access to God through Jesus Christ, and since special gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as teaching, preaching, and spiritual counsel, are the treasures of the Church as well as of the individual, it is necessary and proper that the Church should make fuller use of such gifts for the develop-

ment of its corporate spiritual life and for the extension of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

In particular, we share in the conviction, repeatedly expressed in this Conference, that pending the solution of the questions of faith and order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals but as Churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples. We therefore commend to our Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service to more effective expression.

In conclusion, we express our thankfulness to Almighty God for the great progress which has been made in recent years in the mutual approach of the Churches to one another, and our conviction that we must go forward with faith and courage, confident that with the blessing of God we shall be able to solve the problems that lie before us.

NOTES

1. The following is the view of the Orthodox Church, as formulated for us by its representatives.

'The Orthodox Church, regarding the ministry as instituted in the Church by Christ Himself, and as the body which by a special charisma is the organ through which the Church spreads its means of grace such as the sacraments, and believing that the ministry in its threefold form of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons can only be based on the unbroken apostolic succession, regrets that it is unable to come in regard to the ministry into some measure of agreement with many of the Churches represented at this Conference; but prays God that He, through His Holy Spirit, will guide to union even in regard to this difficult point of disagreement.'

2. In Western Christendom also there are conspicuous differences.

One representative view includes the following points: (*a*) that there have always been various grades of the ministry, each with its own function; (*b*) that ordination is a sacramental act of divine institution, and therefore indispensable, conveying the special charisma for the particular ministry; (*c*) that Bishops who have received their office by succession from the Apostles are the necessary ministers of ordination; (*d*) that the apostolic succession

so understood is necessary for the authority of the ministry, the visible unity of the Church, and the validity of the sacraments.

On the other hand it is held by many Churches represented in the Conference (*a*) that essentially there is only one ministry, that of the Word and Sacraments; (*b*) that the existing ministries in these Churches are agreeable to the New Testament, are proved by their fruits and have due authority in the Church, and the sacraments ministered by them are valid; (*c*) that no particular form of ministry is necessary to be received as a matter of faith; (*d*) that the grace which fits men for the ministry is immediately given by God, and is recognized, not conferred, in ordination.

Further we record that there are views concerning the ministry which are intermediate between the types just mentioned. For instance, some who adhere to an episcopal system of church government do not consider that the apostolic succession as described above is a vital element of episcopacy, or they reject it altogether. Others do not regard as essential the historic Episcopate. Those who adhere to presbyteral systems of church government believe that the apostolic ministry is transmissible and has been transmitted through Presbyters orderly associated for the purpose. Those who adhere to the congregational system of government define their ministry as having been and being transmitted according to the precedent and example of the New Testament.

97. *The Sacraments*

REPORT OF SECTION VI

RECEIVED BY THE FULL CONFERENCE, *nem. con.*

AUGUST 20, 1927

We are convinced that for the purpose in view in this Conference we should not go into detail in considering Sacraments—by some called 'Mysteries'. The purpose therefore of this statement is to show that there may be a common approach to and appreciation of Sacraments on the part of those who may otherwise differ in conception and interpretation.

We testify to the fact that the Christian world gives evidence of an increasing sense of the significance and value of Sacraments, and would express our belief that this move ment should be fostered and guided as a means of deepening the life and experience of the Churches. In this connexion

we recognize that the Sacraments have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church and that the grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through Faith.

We agree that Sacraments are of divine appointment and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts.

We hold that in the Sacraments there is an outward sign and an inward grace, and that the Sacraments are means of grace through which God works invisibly in us. We recognize also that in the gifts of His grace God is not limited by His own Sacraments.

The Orthodox Church and others hold that there are seven Sacraments and that for their valid administration there must be a proper form, a proper matter, and a proper ministry. Others can regard only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Sacraments. Others again, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through immediate contact with God through His Spirit. In this Conference we lay stress on the two Sacraments of Baptism and Lord's Supper, because they are the Sacraments which are generally acknowledged by the members of this Conference.

We believe that in Baptism administered with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins, we are baptized by one Spirit into one body. By this statement it is not meant to ignore the difference in conception, interpretation, and mode which exist among us.

We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present, that we have fellowship with God our Father in Jesus Christ His Son, our Living Lord, who is our one Bread, given for the life of the world, sustaining the life of all His people, and that we are in fellowship with all others who are united to Him. We agree that the Sacrament of the

Lord's Supper is the Church's most sacred act of worship in which the Lord's atoning death is commemorated and proclaimed, and that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and an act of solemn self-oblation.

There are among us divergent views, especially as to (1) the mode and manner of the presence of our Lord; (2) the conception of the commemoration and the sacrifice; (3) the relation of the elements to the grace conveyed; and (4) the relation between the minister of this Sacrament and the validity and efficacy of the rite. We are aware that the reality of the divine presence and gift in this Sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language.

We close this statement with the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed.

98. Foreword to the Report on Subject VII

The report of Section VII, on the Unity of Christendom and the relation thereto of existing Churches, was presented to the Conference on Thursday, August 18, 1927, by the Chairman of the Section, the Archbishop of Upsala, and after discussion, in which various amendments were proposed, 'was referred to the Drafting Committee for the consideration of the proposed amendments'. The text of the first draft, together with an abstract of the discussion, is found in the official Proceedings of the Conference ('Faith and Order'), pp. 396–403.

In the absence of the Archbishop of Upsala, a revision of the Report was presented to the full Conference on Saturday, August 20, by the Archbishop of Armagh, the Vice-Chairman of the Section. After debate, in which it appeared that the revision would not receive the unanimous approval of the Conference, the President suggested as a proposal likely to meet all difficulties 'that the Report should be received

by the Conference in the same way as the other reports, but on the understanding that it should be referred to the Continuation Committee for further consideration,' it being further explained 'that the Continuation Committee would take such action as it considered advisable in view of the knowledge it had of the situation'. This proposal was adopted by the Conference. The text of the revised report, together with a brief abstract of the discussion which followed, is found in the Proceedings of the Conference, pp. 435–9.

At a meeting of the Continuation Committee held on August 20, 1927, the following action was taken:

With reference to the Report on Subject VII which had been received by the World Conference on Faith and Order for transmission to the Continuation Committee, it was agreed that a committee be appointed with the duty of considering the whole situation with regard to Subject VII and reporting back to the Business Committee. The following were named:

Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester, Convener
Rev. William Adams Brown, D.D.
Rt. Rev. James De Wolf Perry, D.D.
Gen.-Sup. D. Dr. Otto Dibelius
Rev. Timothy Tingfang Lew, Ph.D.

At the suggestion of the President of the Conference, the Archbishop of Upsala was afterwards added to the Committee.

Acting under the instructions thus given, the Committee prepared a revised draft of Report on Subject VII in which, without introducing any new matter of their own, they endeavoured to meet the criticisms which had been made of the Report in its earlier forms by rearrangement of material, by more exact reference to previous actions of the Conference itself, and by following more consistently the precedent set in earlier reports of stating alternative positions where there was difference of view.

In the course of its deliberations the Committee received valuable suggestions from many members of the Conference, especially from the Archbishop of Armagh, Professor Merle d'Aubigné, and Archbishop Germanos. The latter contributed valuable notes on the attitude of the Orthodox Church to certain points raised in the Report.

The Report, thus amended and revised, was presented to the Business Committee on December 21, 1927, and after full consideration and the adoption of certain minor amendments is by them submitted to the churches for such consideration as they may desire to give it.

99. *The Unity of Christendom and the relation thereto of existing Churches*

Report on Subject VII

Presented with Amendments to the Business Committee, and submitted to the Churches December 1927

Reports II to VI register the degree of unity in the conception of the Church to which the Conference has thus far attained. It remains in this closing report to consider the consequences which follow for the existing churches.

I

Report II declares that 'the message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ . . . the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ'.

Report III declares that 'God who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. . . . As there is but one Christ, and one life in Him, and one Holy Spirit who guides into all truth, so there is and can be but one Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.'

Report IV declares that 'notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Oecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continually confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ'.

Report V declares that 'the ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church. . . . The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments, to be made effective by faith.'

Report VI declares that 'Sacraments are of divine appointment and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts'; that they 'have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church and that the grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through faith'.

II

The unity of the Church implies a unity in Faith and Order, but it does not mean uniformity. There must be space for divers types of expression, provided that those things which safeguard the unity in essentials are maintained. The various communions should bring into the common life of the Church those elements which express their characteristic gifts, so that nothing of the rich variety which marks Christian experience will be lost, and the liberty of interpretation within the limits of the accepted faith will be preserved.

Further, there are differences as to the ultimate form which it is God's will His Church should take. Some hold that this form 'was determined by Christ Himself and is

therefore unchangeable; others that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms' (Report III), and therefore make place in their view of the Church of the future for diversity of doctrine, worship, and order. Still others admit diversity of worship and order, but not of doctrine.

This difference of ideal affects the view taken of the steps through which the ideal is to be reached, some interpreting the limit of legitimate variation in doctrinal statement and in the administration of church ordinances more strictly than others; but there is widespread agreement that there must be some unity of faith and practice and some liberty of interpretation as to the nature of sacramental grace and of ministerial order and authority. (See the appended 'Note to Section II'.)

III

As the individual disciple is known by his fruits, so the unity of the disciples is shown by their fellowship in the service of the Master. Report V declares that, 'pending the solution of the questions of faith and order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals but as Churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples'; but there is difference as to the exact form this co-operation should take.

In his Encyclical Letter of 1920, the Oecumenical Patriarch proposed 'that a league or council of the churches should be formed for practical purposes'[1]. It has been suggested that such a council might be evolved from already existing organizations, such as the Continuation Committee on Life and Work, consisting of representatives officially appointed by almost all the Christian Communions, and other organizations of similar nature. Some of us believe that such a

[1] See *Document* No. 13 *supra*. [Editor.]

council if formed should include, as its two branches, questions of life and work and of faith and order. Others believe that, for the present, it would be wiser for the movements represented by Stockholm and Lausanne to develop in independence, each following its own way; but there is general agreement that ultimately life, work, faith, and order are expressions of an existing spiritual unity, and that each requires the other for its complete fruition. 'We therefore commend to our Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service to more effective expression' (Report V).

IV

As material for such consideration, the following suggestions which it was impossible adequately to discuss at Lausanne are passed on to the churches:

1. In preparation for closer fellowship, each communion should seek more intimate knowledge of the faith and life, worship and order of the others. Differences which are the outgrowth of complicated historical developments may preserve some aspect of truth or of life which is of value to the church as a whole, or they may sometimes prove to be less important than they are supposed to be. As the different communions come to know one another better, they will grow in understanding and in appreciation of one another.

2. It has not been possible for the Conference to consider with the care which it deserves the relation of the existing churches to one another or the place which each or any of them may hold in the undivided church. We commend to the churches the suggestions which have been made on this subject in the addresses delivered at the Conference. In the meantime, we welcome the movement already under way for the union of bodies of similar doctrine, polity, and worship, and trust that it may continue with ever greater success.

3. Pending the complete, organic union of the different churches, we note with satisfaction a number of movements for practical co-operation along social, evangelistic, and other lines. Experience shows that it has been possible for widely separate bodies to co-operate in such movements with mutual profit and without surrender of principle. (See the appended 'Notes to Section IV', Note A.) There is abundant evidence that when communions undertake together the divine task of bringing the love of Christ to those who do not know Him, they become closer to one another. Especially we commend to the churches the consideration of what steps can be taken to eliminate needless overlapping and competition in the local community; that in ways consistent with the genius of the several communions, our existing unity in Christ may be manifest to the world. (See the appended 'Notes to Section IV', Note B.)

V

We note with gratitude to God the recent increase of effective co-operation in the mission field. The purpose of all missionary work is to carry the eternal Gospel to the ends of the earth, so that it may meet the spiritual needs of every nation and bring all men to the Saviour. Here more than anywhere else unity is essential. We note with sympathy the degree of union which has already been attained in many countries and the plans which are proposed for further union. We commend these plans to the churches for their careful consideration.

The demand which comes from the churches of the Mission field is that the Churches at home should grant them greater freedom of action, and that their hopes of unity should not be frustrated by the long-continued acquiescence in disunion at home which makes it difficult to recognize how fatal disunion is to the new indigenous churches.

VI

Complete fellowship in the Church will be realized only when the way is opened for all God's children to join in communion at the Lord's table. Through prayer and thoughtful deliberation the steps must be found which will most effectively lead to this goal. Ambiguous statements and hasty measures may hinder rather than hasten the work of unification. Yet if we are ever to become one, we must not shrink from the task. Some of us believe that full communion can be reached only at the end of the process of unification; others that it may be used by God as the means to that end. Whatever the way to the goal, complete unity will require that the Churches be so transformed that there may be full recognition of one another by members of all communions.

Nothing will do more to hasten the union for which we all long than that in our daily prayer, both as individuals and as churches, we should remember one another. It has been suggested that a common prayer be sent out in the name of the Conference to be used at a convenient time by all Christian Churches. Especially would we bear on our hearts before God our brethren who are passing through suffering, praying that grace may be given to them to stand firm under their afflictions, and that to them and to us alike, God will grant the spirit of sacrifice as we remember the word of the Lord Jesus: 'If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me.' God give us, both as individuals and as churches, wisdom and courage to do His will.

NOTE TO SECTION II

It must be noted that representatives of the Orthodox Church would guard their acceptance of any diversity in matters of Faith and Order (Section II) by the following limitations.

(*a*) The types of expression so far as these types have been established by Oecumenical Synods must be maintained.

(*b*) Liberty of interpretation comes within the sphere of the Church as a whole and not of different sections or individuals.

(*c*) They cannot agree that 'there must be some liberty of interpretation as to the nature of sacramental grace, and of ministerial order and authority'.

(*d*) They admit differences in worship so long as they do not diverge from the common doctrinal basis, on which is based the Holy Worship as handed down from the times of the Apostles.

NOTES TO SECTION IV, PAR. 3

A. There are some who believe that co-operation should take the form of federation, either local, national, or international: others oppose federation, fearing that it may become a substitute for complete organic union. In the interest of clarity of thought it is important to remember that the word 'federation' is used in at least three different senses. It may denote either

1. A substitute for organic union.
2. A step on the road to organic union.
3. A form of organic union.

In discussing federation it is important to make clear in which of these different senses the word is used.

B. It is suggested that in the case of communions of similar doctrine and polity, the desired expression of unity may often be secured by the method of denominational comity. In the case of those communions which are separated by fundamental differences of view, the problem is more difficult and will require special consideration.

100. Concluding Statement

DRAFTED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONFERENCE AT ITS REQUEST. AUGUST 1927

We have finished our immediate task. From first to last we are able to express it in constructive terms written and received, whether they be statements of agreement or statements of difference, in brotherly love and mutual consideration. They are the product of the minds of men who earnestly desired and strove to place and keep themselves under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Human imperfections which mingle with them we pray God to pardon. In

offering to Him our handiwork, we are but returning to Him that which He has given to us. We pray His acceptance of and blessing upon our offering.

However, we have not finished our whole task. We have but taken a step on a long journey. The Conference was only a new starting point. What we did there will crumble into dust unless the representatives at Lausanne bring home to their several Churches the duty and responsibility of studying the Reports which they themselves received for this very purpose. The Conference should be repeated in every main ecclesiastical assembly, as well as in each separate congregation, throughout our entire Christian constituency if we are to take full advantage of the progress registered. By our presence and activity at Lausanne we are solemnly pledged to reproduce, each in his own local circle, the spirit and method which made the World Conference on Faith and Order what it was. 'I pray you to give me the utter joy of knowing you are living in harmony, with the same feelings of love, with one heart and soul, never acting for private ends or from vanity, but humbly considering each other the better man, and each with an eye to the interests of others as well as to his own. Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus.' [1]

We who have been privileged to labour together have done so in the joyousness of unhampered freedom. We must not forget, in the liberty which is to us a commonplace, the sufferings which some of our Christian brethren are at this very moment undergoing. Deprived of liberty, in hostile surroundings, their cry goes up to God from the house of their martyrdom. Our prayers enfold them and our sympathy stretches out affectionate arms toward them.

Finally, we commend the Christian Churches, whether represented in the Conference or not, to our Heavenly Father's guidance and safe keeping, looking earnestly to-

[1] Phil. ii. 2–5. Moffatt's translation.

ward the day when the full mind of God will control all the affairs of mankind.

101. Declaration on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox Church

[Read in English by the Metropolitan of Thyateira (Germanos) to the full session of the World Conference prior to the discussion of Reports VI and VII.]

August 18, 1927

Brethren, on receiving the invitation of the Organizing Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order seven years ago, the Orthodox Church answered readily by sending representatives from her particular Orthodox Churches to the preliminary Conference in 1920 at Geneva. That delegation of the Orthodox Church put before the Conference a united declaration in general terms of the teaching of their Church in the matter of faith and order, and at its conclusion recommended that before any discussion of the reunion of the Churches in faith and order, a League of Churches should be established for their mutual co-operation in regard to the social and moral principles of Christendom. Further, when the Orthodox Church was invited a short time ago to take part through her representatives in the present Conference, although many of her particular Churches are in distress so grave as to threaten their very existence, she hastened to send her delegation to it.

Accordingly, we, the undersigned, delegates of the Orthodox Church, being inspired by a sincere feeling of love and by a desire to achieve an understanding, have taken part in every meeting held here for the purpose of promoting closer brotherhood and fellowship between the representatives of the different Churches and for the general good and welfare of the whole body of Christians. But while sharing the general labours of the Conference both in delivering addresses

as arranged in the programme and in taking part in the open debates, as also in the work of the Sections, we have concluded with regret that the bases assumed for the foundation of the Reports, which are to be submitted to the vote of the Conference, are inconsistent with the principles of the Orthodox Church which we represent.

Therefore, we judge it to be a matter of conscience that with the exception of the first we must abstain from voting in favour of the two Reports which are now ready. Although both in the papers read, in speeches, in debate and in statements made in the three Sections, we Orthodox have already made plain and clear what are the points of view and the conceptions of the Orthodox Church in regard to the subjects under discussion, we hold it to be of importance that we should specify here certain points in order to make manifest the differences which separate us from other members of the Conference. For example, while the Report on the Message of the Church, since it is drafted on the basis of the teaching of the Holy Scripture, is in accordance with the Orthodox conception and can be accepted by us, it is otherwise with the two other Reports, on the Nature of the Church and upon the Common Confession of the Faith of the Church. The drafting of these two latter was carried out on a basis of compromise between what in our understanding are conflicting ideas and meanings, in order to arrive at an external agreement in the letter alone: whereas, as has often at other times been emphasized in statement by representatives of the Orthodox Church, in matters of faith and conscience there is room for no compromise. For us, two different meanings cannot be covered by, and two different concepts cannot be deduced from, the same words of a generally agreed statement. Nor can we Orthodox hope that an agreement reached upon such statements would remain lasting.

That the drafting committees have realized the existence

of this disagreement is apparent from many of the notes which they have placed in the Reports and which leave full liberty upon matters which at least we Orthodox hold to be fundamental. Thus, for example, we Orthodox cannot conceive a united Church in which some of its members would hold that there is only one source of divine revelation, namely, Holy Scripture alone; but others would affirm that apostolic tradition is the necessary completion of Holy Scripture. While the full freedom so accorded in the Report to each Church to use its own confession of faith would make those confessions of indifferent value in themselves, on the other hand, nothing but confusion as to the one common conception of *the* Faith of the so united single Church could arise.

The Orthodox Church adheres fixedly to the principle that the limits of individual liberty of belief are determined by the definitions made by the whole Church, which definitions we maintain to be obligatory on each individual. This principle holds good for us not only as to the present members of the Orthodox Church, but also as to those who, in future, may become united with it in faith and order. Moreover, the symbols which would be accepted by the united Church acquire their importance (in our conception as Orthodox) not only from the fact of their being historical witnesses of the faith of the primitive Church, but above all because the Church has affirmed their validity in her Oecumenical Councils. It should be unnecessary for us to add that the Orthodox Church recognizes and accepts as an Oecumenical Symbol only the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople.

That which holds good for us in regard to the Oecumenical Symbol holds good also in regard to the dogmatic definitions of the Seven Oecumenical Councils, the authority of which no Orthodox would be justified in shaking.

Therefore the mind of the Orthodox Church is that reunion can take place only on the basis of the common faith

and confession of the ancient, undivided Church of the seven Oecumenical Councils and of the first eight centuries.

Although the Reports of the other three Sections are not yet to hand, the process of debate upon them makes it evident that agreement on them can be reached only by vague phrases, or by a compromise of antithetical opinions. Thus, for example, we cannot conceive how agreement can be made possible between two conceptions which agree that the existence of the ministry of the Church is by the will of Christ, but differ as to whether that ministry was instituted by Christ Himself in its three degrees of bishop, priest, and deacon. In the same way we judge there to be no practical value in an agreed formula as to the necessity of sacraments in the Church, when there is a fundamental difference between the Churches not only in regard to their number but also as to their particular effects.

This being so, we cannot entertain the idea of a reunion which is confined to a few common points of verbal statement; for according to the Orthodox Church where the totality of the faith is absent there can be no *communio in sacris*.

Nor can we here apply that principle of economy which in the past the Orthodox Church has applied under quite other circumstances in the case of those who came to her with a view to union with her.

In consequence, while we, the undersigned Orthodox representatives, must refrain from agreeing to any Reports other than that upon the Message of the Church, which we accept and are ready to vote upon, we desire to declare that in our judgement the most which we can now do is to enter into co-operation with other Churches in the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian love. Further, we desire to add that as Orthodox Delegates we should view a partial reunion of those Churches which share the same principles with satisfaction as a precedent to general reunion, inasmuch

as it would thus be easier for our Orthodox Church to discuss reunion with the Churches which had so united into a single Church and had a single faith, than with many Churches with different faiths.

In making it plain that we have arrived at our decision only in obedience to the dictates of our conscience we beg to assure the Conference that we have derived much comfort here from the experience that, although divided by dogmatic differences, we are one with our brethren here in faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Declaring that in the future we shall not cease to devote ourselves to labour for the closer approach of the Churches, we add that we shall pray to God without ceasing that by the operation of His Holy Spirit He will take away all existing hindrances and will guide us to that unity for which the Founder and Ruler of the Church prayed to His heavenly Father: 'that they all may be one as we are one.'

We close with the intercession that out Lord will richly give His blessing to one and all who labour in sincerity and in His fear for the establishment of His kingdom among men.

Delegates from the Oecumenical Patriarchate: GERMANOS, Archbishop of Thyateira; MICHAEL CONSTANINIDIS, Archimandrite; Dr. PARASKEVAIDIS, Archimandrite; C. VALIADIS, Archimandrite.

The Patriarchate of Alexandria: CHRISTOPHOROS, Archbishop of Leontopolis; NICOLAS, Archbishop of Nubia.

The Patriarchate of Jerusalem: KALLINICOS, Archimandrite; BENEDICTOS, Deacon.

Archbishopric of Cyprus and the Church of Greece: AMBROSIOS, Metropolitan of Naupactos; CONSTANTINE DIOBOUNIOTIS; H. ALIVISATOS; D. S. BALANOS.

The Patriarchate of Serbia: IRINEY, Bishop of Novi Sad.

The Patriarchate of Roumania: NECTARIE, Archbishop of Cernauti and Metropolitan of Bukovina.

The Church of Bulgaria: Proto-presbyter Prof. Dr. STEFAN ZANKOW; Professor NICHOLAS GLUBOKOWSKY, D.D.

The Church of Poland: DIONISY, Metropolitan of Warsaw and all Poland; Archpriest BENEDICT J. TURKEVICH; Dr. NICOLAS ARSENIEW.

Russian Delegates: EULOGIOS, Metropolitan of the Russian Church in Western Europe; Archpriest Prof. Dr. SERGIUS BULGAKOW.

Georgian Delegate: Dr. GREGORY PERADSE.

102. The Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MALOJA, AUGUST 1929

'As members of the Continuation Committee of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, meeting at Maloja, August 27–30, 1929, we desire, as in our last meeting, to recognize the great progress towards unity in the life of the Churches which has been manifested in recent events in Canada, Japan, China, and the United States of America, and indeed throughout the whole Christian world.

'We rejoice with our brethren of the Churches in Scotland in the consummation this year of union between the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland, and we pray that God will endue the reunited Church with the manifold gifts of His grace.

'We also welcome the approaching union of the three Methodist Churches of Great Britain who have this year obtained from Parliament the Enabling Act to carry out the Scheme of Union already approved by the Conferences of the three Churches.

'Without expressing any judgement upon the details of the Proposed Scheme of Union for the Churches of South India, we welcome the statement with which it is prefaced

that "unity of the Spirit must find expression in the Faith and Order of the Church, in its worship, in its organization, and in its whole life".

'We believe with them that their union, if carried out on right lines, would result in greater fellowship and peace within the Church and greater eagerness and effectiveness in the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ.

'We are impelled by our deep sense of the importance of these proposals to ask all Christian people to join with us in supplication that divine guidance may be granted to the Churches of South India, and to all those upon whom any measure of responsibility in this matter may rest.'

II. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES (1921–5)

[The Conversations were held at Malines, Belgium, 1921–5, Cardinal Mercier acted both as host and President, and the following were present: Viscount Halifax, Dr. Armitage Robinson (Dean of Wells), the Rev. W. H. Frere (later Bishop of Truro), Mgr. Van Roey (who succeeded Cardinal Mercier as Archbishop of Malines), M. F. Portal, being joined after the first two meetings by Dr. Gore (formerly Bishop of Oxford), Dr. Kidd (Warden of Keble College, Oxford), Mgr. Battiffol and M. Hemmer. The first public reference to these conversations was made by the Archbishop of Canterbury at Christmas 1923, in a Letter printed as No. 89 in the first part of these *Documents* (see also No. 90). A Report was subsequently prepared and published in 1928 by the Oxford University Press. It consisted of two accounts with three appendices. The two accounts of 'the four Conversations' were drawn up independently by the Roman Catholics and the Anglicans; 'but at a fifth meeting held on October 11 and 12, 1926, each of them was read, discussed, and amended by both parties acting in collaboration'. Each side was responsible only for its own account; but each had the advantage of the criticism of the other. The following Extracts have been made by permission, and it is agreed by the Anglican editor (Dr. B. J. Kidd) that they contain the gist of the discussions. When the Report, *The Conversations at Malines 1921–5* (in English and French), was originally drawn up it was hoped that 'further Conversations may, under God's guidance, contribute yet more to the great cause which we have at heart'. But since Cardinal Mercier's death on January 23, 1926, the work has remained unfinished and further Conversations have been discouraged by the Vatican. Of the Extracts which follow, the first five come from the Anglican, the sixth and seventh from the Roman Catholic account.]

103. Statement by the Anglican Group on the Position of St. Peter.

[Made at the Third Meeting, November 1923, after discussion of a Memorandum by one of the Anglican members (Dr. Armitage Robinson), who, as set out below, added to the brief statement of the four points a supplementary statement of his own.]

A Summary of the New Testament Evidence as to the Position of St. Peter

1. The point with which we are concerned in this brief statement is solely the position of St. Peter among the other Apostles, as evidenced by the New Testament.

2. We recognize that St. Peter was the accepted chief or leader of the Apostles, and was so accepted because he was treated so by our Lord.

3. In the passage of St. Matthew xvi, we recognize that it was to St. Peter as the chief leader of the apostolic company that our Lord made the threefold promise; but we find in the New Testament reason to believe that the promises there made to one were fulfilled to all the Twelve—so that all constitute the foundation of the Church, all have the keys of the kingdom, and all have the authority to bind and to loose. St. Peter's special position, therefore, we hold to have lain, not in any jurisdiction which he alone held, but in a leadership among the other Apostles.

4. What is here said from the biblical evidence is not intended to exclude the consideration of the bearing of the later tradition of the Church upon the whole subject.

The writer of the Anglican memorandum desired to add to it a supplementary statement to express his view in a summary form as the result of the discussion which had taken place:

'There is, so far as I am able to judge the evidence, no trace in the New Testament of a jurisdiction of St. Peter over other Apostles, or over churches founded by them.

Everything in the history there recorded points the opposite way. "Jurisdiction" may be asserted in the case of St. Paul in regard to the local churches of his foundation: the history makes it plain that he claimed to rule them absolutely in Christ's name and by the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We may perhaps assume that the like was true of local churches founded by St. Peter or others of the Twelve, but direct evidence is wanting.

'On the other hand, the evidence of the New Testament justifies us in saying that St. Peter was chosen and marked out by our Lord to exercise a primacy of leadership among the Twelve—to be their spokesman and leader, though not their ruler. This seems abundantly attested in the first half of the Acts of the Apostles. But in the second half of that book a new figure fills the scene—another Apostle with a new and independent commission from Christ; and he in his own sphere is found to exercise a similar primacy of leadership, more especially in regard to the churches of the Gentiles. He desires to be in accord with St. Peter, for the sake of the unity of the Church; but he does not admit that he is in any way dependent upon him.[1]

'Do we then affirm that in what has been said above we have exhausted the meaning of the promises addressed by our Lord to St. Peter? For myself I cannot say so. In accordance with what I believe to be a principle of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* I cannot accept as final an interpretation of Scripture which takes no account of the interpretations placed upon it by the early Fathers, or of the providential guidance of the Church as revealed in history. The words "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church" have haunted the mind of Christendom, and have been, in part at least, the cause of the pre-eminent position of the Church of Rome throughout the centuries. It remains to be considered what that pre-eminence may rightly be said to involve, whether we regard it as an inheritance derived from the pre-eminence of St. Peter among the Twelve, or whether we regard it as originally due to some other cause. This is the inquiry on which we are next to enter.'

[1] I remark in passing that it was a true instinct that made the Church of Rome emphasize in early days the fact that it was consecrated by the blood of both those great Apostles.

104. Statement by the Roman Catholic Group on the Position of St. Peter

[Made immediately after the Anglican Statement (103) at the Third Meeting, November 1923.]

I. There are abundant indications in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Gospel of St. John that Peter fulfilled a peculiar function of service towards Jesus and among His disciples. The cause of this is to be found neither in the fact that he was the first that was called by Jesus, nor in the forcefulness of his character, but in a determination of the will of Jesus.

The Saviour manifests more explicitly this His will by the words 'Thou art Peter' of St. Matthew, 'Strengthen thy brethren' of St. Luke, and 'Feed my lambs' of the Fourth Gospel.

II. This will discloses itself in the Acts by the fact that Peter appears and acts as the head of the primitive community (leader of the Church); and Paul, who claims the apostolate of the Gentiles, recognizes Peter as the apostle of the Circumcision, and never attempts to deny to Peter a more extended mission.

III. We hold that the sayings of the Gospel—notably the *Tu es Petrus* and the *Pasce agnos*—express a prerogative of Peter as the foundation of the Church and the principle of its unity.

We consider that the events of history have thrown light on these texts which has brought out more clearly their true significance.

IV. The Vatican Council defines as of the Catholic Faith the primacy of universal jurisdiction conferred on Peter, grounding itself on the two texts *Tu es Petrus* and *Pasce oves*. It declares that the denial of the primacy is contrary to the plain sense of Holy Scripture as the Catholic Church has always understood it.

The Council does not indicate the numerous testimonies

which prove the tradition in the interpretation of the texts, and which are to be found in the patrology and ancient Christian literature.

105. An Anglican Memorandum on the Petrine Texts, as employed to A.D. *461*

[Made at the Third Meeting, November 1923. As originally presented by an Anglican (Dr. Kidd) it was discussed, with the assistance of a Memorandum on the other side. In the end the points stated in the Anglican Memorandum were modified and formulated as follows.]

1. That the Roman Church was founded and built by St. Peter and St. Paul, according to St. Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* iii. 3. 2).

2. That the Roman See is the only historically known Apostolic See of the West.

3. That the Bishop of Rome is, as Augustine said of Pope Innocent I, president of the Western Church (*Contra Iulianum Pelagianum,* i. 13).

4. That he has a primacy among all the Bishops of Christendom; so that, without communion with him, there is in fact no prospect of a reunited Christendom.

5. That to the Roman See the churches of the English owe their Christianity through 'Gregory our father' (Council of Clovesho, A.D. 747) 'who sent us baptism' (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *Anno* 565).

106. Statement by the Anglican Group on some considerations following on the Discussion about Relations between the Pope and the Bishops

[Made at the Fourth Meeting, May 1925, after considerable discussions in which opinions were very freely expressed on both sides.]

The Church is a living body under the authority of the bishops as successors of the Apostles: and from the beginnings of Church history a primacy and leadership among all the bishops has been recognized as belonging to the Bishop

of Rome. Nor can we imagine that any reunion of Christendom could be effected except on the recognition of the primacy of the Pope.

But while we think that both the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Churches would be prepared to recognize such primacy, we do not think it likely that they would be ready to define it more closely.

However, the following points may be usefully stated:

1. The authority of the Pope is not separate from that of the episcopate; nor in normal circumstances can the authority of the episcopate be exercised in disassociation from that of its chief.

2. In virtue of that primacy the Pope can claim to occupy a position in regard to all other bishops which no other bishop claims to occupy in regard to him.

3. The exercise of that primacy has in time past varied in regard to time and place: and it may vary again. And this adds to the difficulty of defining the respective rights of the Holy See on the one side, and of the episcopate upon the other.

107. A Summary of the Conversations

[At the end of the Anglican account of the Conversations.]

It may be convenient to add a few words to the Report, partly of summary, and partly of anticipation. The Conversations have touched upon questions both of doctrine and discipline. On the first two occasions the main object was to ascertain that in both of these spheres there was sufficient agreement to justify a further and more detailed examination of the main points at issue.

The First Conversation showed that a considerable number of dogmatic questions, which had been subjects of contention in the past, need not be so in the future at all, or at any rate not in the same degree. The Second revealed new possibilities with regard to organization. Then the more

detailed examination began with the Third Conversation, at which the membership was increased from six to ten. On that occasion the crucial question of the papacy occupied the whole time; and this subject was continued during the greater part of the Fourth Conversation. Some space, however, was given to further proposals on the subject of organization put forward from the Roman Catholic side. The Fifth Meeting (October 11 and 12, 1926), with its members reduced on the one side by the irreparable loss of Cardinal Mercier and the Abbé Portal and on the other by the absence of Bishop Gore and the Dean of Wells, was concerned only with the drawing up of this Report.

The net gain of this series of Conversations may be described as the elimination of several subjects which have ceased to be causes of difference, and the elucidation of others that still remain. As regards other dogmatic points, including those that were handled briefly in the First Conversation, and, in particular, the doctrine of the Sacraments, we say no more here because they are sufficiently treated in the French Report [1] with which we are in substantial agreement, and also because there is an opening for further discussion which, we think, would be profitable, and would lead not only to a better understanding but also to a greater measure of general agreement upon the matters in question.

The Anglicans who have had the privilege of being present at the group of Meetings above described desire to place on record their deep sense of the unvarying kindness shown to them by Cardinal Mercier, of the greatness of the debt which they feel is owing to him, of the profound and heartfelt sorrow which his death has caused them, and of the affectionate remembrance in which his name will ever be cherished by those who have during the past years enjoyed his unbounded hospitality.

The Cardinal's gracious presidency secured an atmosphere

[1] See No. 108.

in which the plainest speaking on either side was compatible with unbroken friendliness and an ever-increasing desire for a sympathetic understanding of the several positions entertained by those who had met for conference under his roof. They feel that it would be altogether premature, and might even be misleading, were they to attempt any further indications of progress toward agreement on the one hand and outstanding differences on the other, than can be readily gathered from a careful perusal of the brief account here given of their proceedings. Though the conferences have been held with the goodwill of authority, the utterances made at them have been made quite freely on the responsibility of those present, and formally commit no one but themselves. They are convinced that it is on the lines of such friendly conversations that true progress is to be made in achieving the reunion of Christendom, which must be so near to all Christian hearts; and they would express the earnest hope that similar conferences may be continued in the future, in order that the work begun with Cardinal Mercier's blessing and under his auspices may be still further carried on, and by God's blessing and in God's time fulfil words so constantly on the Cardinal's lips, *Ut unum sint*.

108. The Roman Catholic Account of Points of Agreement with regard to the Sacraments

[The Roman Catholic account of the Conversations indicates various doctrinal matters on which there is 'undoubted agreement' between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, and follows with more detailed consideration of the Sacraments.]

Passing on from these more general observations to the detailed consideration of the sacraments, and of their efficacy as a means for the sanctification of souls, an agreement is reached without much difficulty on the following points:

1. Baptism constitutes the means of entry into the

Church, and the initiation which baptism inaugurates ought to develop within an organized social life.

2. The social life of Christians is organized round an episcopal hierarchy.

3. This social and organized life finds expression within the Church in the existence and the use of the sacraments.

4. In the Eucharist the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are verily given, taken, and received by the faithful. By consecration the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ.

5. The Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the same sacrifice as that of the cross, but offered in a mystical and sacramental manner.

On the subject of eucharistic doctrine the Anglicans made particular reference to the letter published by the English Archbishops in reply to the Encyclical Letter of Leo XIII on Anglican Orders ; we give below [1] the passage which they state to be a specially authoritative expression of their real belief.

6. Communion in both kinds was once the practice of the whole Church, but in the West communion came to be limited to one kind for practical reasons dependent upon circumstances. Consequently, in our view, communion in both kinds is not a matter of doctrine, but one of ecclesiastical discipline.

[1] Further, we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice, and do not believe it to be a 'nude commemoration' of the Sacrifice of the Cross, an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that Council. But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the holy Eucharist—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again.

For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross,

7. In both Churches provision exists for a ministry and a discipline of penitence, whereby the sinner is reconciled to God through the sacramental absolution which the priest pronounces upon the sinner.

Although the use of the Sacrament of penance and of sacramental absolution is much more widespread in the Roman Catholic Church, yet the formulae given in the Prayer Book for the Order of Communion and for the Visitation of the Sick leave no doubt as to the belief of the Anglican Church in this respect, or as to the opportunity given to its members of having recourse to sacramental absolution for the purpose of their reconciliation with God, if they have fallen into any grave sin.

8. In regard to the anointing of the sick, it is true that

and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.

The original text is as follows:

Eucharistiae etiam sacrificium vere docemus, nec sacrificii crucis *nudam esse commemorationem* credimus, ut Concilio illo citato nobis videtur imputari. Satis tamen credimus in liturgia nostra qua in S. Eucharistia celebranda utimur—corda habentes ad Dominum, et munera, quae antea oblata sunt, iam consecrantes ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiant Domini nostri Jesu Christi—sacrificium quod ibidem fit ita significare. Memoriam scilicet perpetuam pretiosae mortis Christi qui ipse est Advocatus noster apud Patrem et propitiatio pro peccatis nostris, usque ad Adventum Eius secundum praeceptum Eius observamus.

Primo enim sacrificium laudis et gratiarum offerimus; tum vero sacrificium Crucis Patri proponimus et repraesentamus, et per illud remissionem peccatorum et omnia alia Dominicae passionis beneficia pro tota et universa Ecclesia impetramus; sacrificium denique nostrum ipsorum Creatori omnium offerimus, quod per oblationes creaturarum Ipsius iam significavimus. Quam actionem totam, in qua plebs cum sacerdote partem suam necessario sumit, sacrificium Eucharisticum solemus nominare.

(*Responsio archiepiscoporum Angliae ad litteras apostolicas Leonis Papae XIII de ordinationibus anglicanis, p.* 16.)

there is less agreement; but it is to be noticed that there is a tendency among Anglicans to revive the ancient custom of anointing the sick.

Further meetings between Anglicans and Roman Catholics are much to be desired in order to elucidate further these general statements, and to secure that there should be no ambiguity or misunderstanding with regard to their deepest significance. In any case the result of this interchange of explanations is a very hopeful impression that a satisfactory accommodation may be reached with regard to the doctrine of the sacraments regarded as means of grace and of spiritual life.

109. The Roman Catholic Account of Points of Agreement with regard to the Pope

['In the course of an entirely frank conversation on this subject, Anglicans and Roman Catholics expressed in common certain views, which we quote, either from propositions formulated by one or the other party, or else from explanations made by way of commentary. These, without in any way forcing their meaning, may be summarized as follows:']

St. Peter was accepted as chief or 'leader' because he was treated as such by our Lord.

The see of Rome is the only apostolic see known in the West. No Patriarchate has ever been established there side by side with Rome; and the Pope, according to Saint Augustine's phrase in regard to Innocent I, 'presides over the Western Church'. The Church of England, in particular, owes its christianity to the Roman see, which, through the agency of Saint Gregory, 'sent it Baptism'.

Further, the Pope possesses a primacy among all the bishops of Christendom; so much so that, apart from communion with him, there is no hope or prospect of ever seeing a reunited Christendom. He occupies, in regard to all bishops, a position such as no other bishop can claim in regard to him.

From the first beginning of Church History there has been recognized to belong to the Bishop of Rome amongst all bishops a primacy and a power of general leadership.

Thus the primacy of the Pope is not merely a primacy of honour, but it implies a duty of solicitude and of activity within the universal Church for the general good, in such wise that the Pope should in fact be a centre of unity, and a Head which exercises an authority over the whole. It was, in fact, on many occasions due to the action of the papacy that the medieval bishops were able to defend themselves against the encroachments of the Civil Power. The papacy has been a guarantee of the spiritual independence of the Church.

110. A Suggested Basis for Practical Action

(15 March 1923)

[This statement stands on a different footing from the preceding extracts from the official Report of the Conversations. It was not included in that Report, but was published later on his own authority by Viscount Halifax in a volume entitled *The Conversations at Malines 1921–5: Original Documents* (Philip Allan 1930). The circumstances were as follows: Two statements were prepared at the end of the second conference, 14–15 March 1923, one in French, the other in English. The French statement is described below as 'The statement drawn up by His Eminence'. It was longer than the English, referred to the origin of the Conversations, and concluded by putting certain questions with regard to the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and means that might be taken to secure the recognition of the Archbishop of Canterbury as Primate of the Church of England 're-attached to Rome'. It was signed by the French and attested by the English members. The English statement has no historical introduction, but otherwise deals with much the same points as the French. It is signed by the English and attested by the French members. It was after this Conversation that Dr. Gore and Dr. Kidd, M. Batiffol and Abbé Hemmer were added.]

The Anglican representatives, being in hearty agreement with the statement drawn up by his Eminence, desire on their part to sum up the position in the following terms.

As the result of the recent conversations at Malines it was agreed by those who were present that, supposing the doctrinal differences now existing between the two Churches could be satisfactorily explained or removed, and further supposing the difficulty regarding Anglican Orders were surmounted on the lines indicated in the Lambeth Appeal, then the following suggestions would serve as a basis of practical action for the reunion of the two Churches.

1. The acknowledgement of the position of the Papal See as the centre and head on earth of the Catholic Church, from which guidance should be looked for, in general, and especially in grave matters affecting the welfare of the Church as a whole.

2. The acknowledgement of the Anglican Communion as a body linked with the Papal See in virtue of the recognition of the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Metropolitans by the gift of the Pallium.

3. Under the discipline of the English Church would fall the determination of all such questions as

(*a*) The English rite and its use in the Vernacular.
(*b*) Communion in both kinds.
(*c*) Marriage of the Clergy.

4. The position of the existing Roman Catholic hierarchy in England, with their Churches and congregations, would for the present at any rate remain unaltered. They would be exempt from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, and as at present directly dependent on the Roman See.

Accepted for submission to respective authorities.

✠ D. J. Card. Mercier,
Archbp. of Malines.

E. Van Roey, Vic. Gen.

F. Portal.

Halifax.

J. Armitage Robinson.

Walter Howard
Frere, C.R.

111. A Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Dean of Wells

(19 March 1923)

[The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote this letter to the Dean of Wells immediately after receiving the preceding Document. It is printed here in view of the Archbishop's statement (page 47 *infra*), 'In case your memoranda should some day cease to retain their present confidential character it is, I think, important that with them should exist this letter recording my own view of the situation on perusal of the memoranda.' Besides the 'three memoranda' noted below was an important anonymous Memorandum read by the Cardinal, *L'Église Anglicane unie non absorbée*.]

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1.

19th March, 1923.

My dear Dean of Wells,

It is unnecessary for me to assure you with what interest and attention I have read the three memoranda you have now placed in my hands. These are (*a*) The notes which you made beforehand as to the points which might be discussed at Malines; (*b*) The French Memorandum drawn up by Cardinal Mercier during or after your conversations and signed by himself and his two colleagues, with the attestation of the three Anglican representatives; (*c*) The corresponding note drawn up in a different form by the three English members of the Conference, signed by them, and attested by the Roman Catholic members. These papers confirm the assurance I already felt as to the anxious care of your Anglican colleagues and yourself to ensure that the outcome, step by step, of your successive conversations shall be such as not to compromise in any way the characteristic and well proven principles of the Church of England.

You have at the same time evinced the clear desire to hear with respectful attention any statement which our Roman Catholic friends desire to make as to the position—doctrinal, historical, and practical—for which they contend, and which

they had invited you to discuss with them. For I am anxious that it should always be remembered that the actual invitation to these conversations emanated from the Roman Catholic side. I do not forget that the Cardinal's gracious invitation was the result of informal conversations which he had had with Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal, and to them perhaps should be attributed the real initiative.

In the earnestness of my desire and prayer that the Church of Christ on earth may under the good hand of God be drawn into closer unity, I should feel it to be intolerably wrong were we to be lukewarm in our response to any and every overture which may be even faintly made towards such a consummation. The difficulties do not to my eyes grow less as we face the facts. But at least we can, with full hearts and in accordance with Our Lord's example, pray. With my whole soul do I share and reciprocate the evident desire of the honoured and beloved Cardinal under whose roof you met, that we should strive together to secure 'the way of peace'. If I understand you rightly you came to the conclusion, when planning your conversations for last week, that it would be wise to discuss in a general way certain practical and administrative questions which would inevitably arise at once if the large differences of a doctrinal sort which at present sunder us, and which, except in the informal and necessarily inconclusive conversations at your first Conference, you have not yet discussed, should prove to be less insuperable than has been supposed. But you have not been unaware or forgetful of the magnitude of those preliminary differences.

Your English memorandum of last week's conversations refers in its opening paragraph to the necessity that before administrative questions could be reached it would be requisite that 'the doctrinal differences now existing between the two Churches should be satisfactorily explained or removed'. In the French memorandum the Cardinal writes—

'*Supposé que l'assentiment des esprits soit accompli sur le terrain doctrinal*, dans quelles conditions pourrait s'opérer l'union de l'Église anglicane à l'Église romaine?'

This corresponds with what is said in the great document which, after all, lies at the basis of what is now being discussed. I refer to the Lambeth Conference 'Appeal to All Christian People', the document to which Cardinal Mercier made reference in his letter to myself dated January 10, 1923, and also in his Memorandum (*b*). The whole position is to some extent simplified and elucidated if we may believe that our Roman Catholic friends look with a friendly eye upon that Appeal. It too places in the forefront of the conditions requisite for any administrative action between the Churches that 'terms of Union should already have been satisfactorily adjusted'. Its whole object is 'not that any one communion should consent to be absorbed in another, but that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed'.

If then the papers about your Malines conversations are examined thoughtfully by an attentive reader, the necessity of such a preliminary condition will not be doubtful. But not all readers are thoughtful or attentive, and in case your memoranda should some day cease to retain their present confidential character it is, I think, important that with them should exist this letter recording my own view of the situation on perusal of the memoranda.

I take no exception whatever to your plan of discussing first some of the administrative questions you have dwelt upon, provided it is kept always in mind that there are great outstanding questions of a doctrinal sort which would require deliberate discussion and some measure of settlement before administrative problems would even arise.

I should personally place among the foremost of these the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church as to the position,

the jurisdiction, and the powers of the Papal See. The deep significance of that matter may very easily be slurred over in common talk by admitting as an historical and practical matter of so-called general knowledge the 'primacy' of the Bishop of Rome. In certain senses this is an indisputable historical fact. But as used by Roman Catholics his primacy means a great deal more. Though the Vatican Council emphasized and increased what we deem the false doctrine of the Pope's independent and autocratic status as sole Vicar of Christ, the claim had of course been made for many centuries. Its recognition is virtually, and is now even technically, *de fide*. It therefore affects in the widest way both doctrinally and administratively the whole question of the relation of the Church of Rome to the rest of Christendom. It bears upon almost every problem that can come up for discussion. If we are bound—as I certainly believe we are—to discard as untrue the theory that the Bishop of Rome holds *jure Divino* in the Church of Christ a position of distinct and unique authority operative everywhere, and perhaps even—though here I speak with reserve—that, directly or indirectly it is through that channel alone (at all events in the West) that the Ministerial Commission can be rightly or validly exercised, there is an obvious inappropriateness in discussing other Church questions until that fundamental question has been brought to a clear issue. I have not tried to express myself in technical terms, and the words I have used may be open to legitimate criticism. But I hope that I have, for the purpose of this letter, made my meaning sufficiently clear.

There are also, as your conversations have shown, large differences between us, with which the question of Papal status is only indirectly concerned, and these would call of course for full and far-reaching discussion. I refer, for example, to such questions as the dogma of Transubstantiation, or the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed

Virgin: and of course there are others. But the point I have referred to lies so clearly *in limine* that I would urge you, when you next meet (and I hope your conversations will be resumed ere long), to let it be placed in the arena of your deliberations with a view to some sort of definite statement on either side. Such statements may of course in the first instance be provisional only. But the question is so vital a one that it is really essential to the whole.

I have not of course forgotten that you have told me that at your earlier and even less formal meeting in December 1921 the general subject of the authority of the See of Rome formed a subject of conversation, and reference is made to this in Cardinal Mercier's Memorandum (*b*). But that gathering was so entirely informal and preliminary that I believe you prefer that I should confine my comments to what appears in the two Memoranda (*b*) and (*c*) which you have now given me.

I presume that I am right in gathering from the fact that the three Anglicans attested rather than signed the French document, that you do not commit yourselves to its *ipsissima verba*. I am glad of this, for it contains phrases which come quite naturally and in absolute good faith from the Cardinal, but which I should be surprised to find that you would even provisionally adopt. His Eminence virtually describes what is desired as being the absorption of the Church of England in the Church of Rome ('L'entrée en masse dans le giron de l'église romaine'). I have already pointed out how different from this is the language used in the 'Lambeth Conference Appeal to all Christian People'. There are other phrases to which I might call attention, but it is unnecessary.

His Eminence has also, in his historical resumé of what preceded your second conference, fallen inadvertently into an error in supposing that the English Bishops as a whole had responsibility for asking you and your colleagues to go

to Malines, or that you went thither *en leur nom* ('on their behalf'). This puts it much too strongly.

I have given you my view of the situation as disclosed in the memoranda with signatures appended. It is a situation full of difficulty and calling for the utmost circumspection and caution, but it calls also for quiet perseverance, and the gates towards a pathway which may lead unionwards are certainly not peremptorily closed. Subject to what I have said as to the attainment of agreement on the large *doctrinal* questions, I am ready to say that the suggestions which the two memoranda contain are well calculated to furnish the basis for future discussion and conference.

This letter ought to be on record along with your memoranda. It is I think possible that our Roman Catholic friends, unfamiliar perhaps with the strength of opinion on these subjects which is prevalent in large sections of the English Church and people, may suppose us to be ready for a more accommodating acceptance of Roman Catholic contentions and claims than I, for one, can regard as being either possible or in accordance with our deliberate belief as to what is true.

I am, Yours very truly,

RANDALL CANTUAR:

112. Question concerning Conferences (as is alleged) to promote the Unity of all Christian People

ACTS OF THE SACRED CONGREGATIONS

THE SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

(Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 1 August 1927)

[With special reference to the World Conference on Faith and Order]

On the occasion of the conference which is to be held from the 3rd to the 21st of the coming month of August at

Lausanne in Switzerland, a question is addressed to the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office:

'Whether it be lawful for Catholics to be present at or to countenance the conferences, gatherings, assemblies, or associations of non-Catholics which assume that all or any who claim for themselves the name of Christian are joined together in a single bond of religion?'

In the General Congregation, on Wednesday July 6, 1927, their Eminences the Most Reverend the Lord Cardinals, Inquisitors General in matters of faith and morals, ordered that the following reply be made:

'In the Negative, and further that the decree issued by this same Sacred Congregation on July 4, 1919, entitled *De participatione catholicorum societatis* is altogether binding in matters pertaining to the promotion of Christian unity.'

Our most holy Lord Pius, by divine providence the eleventh pope of that name, on the following Thursday, on the 7th day of the same month and year, in the usual audience granted to the Reverend Father, the Lord Assessor to the Holy Office, approved the resolution of their Eminences submitted to him and ordered the publication thereof.

Given at Rome, at the Palace of the Holy Office, July 8, 1927.

ALOISIUS CASTELLANO
Notary of the Sup. Sac. Cong. of the Holy Office.

113. Encyclical Letter (Mortalium Animos) on fostering True Religious Union of Our Most Holy Lord Pius XI, by Divine Providence Pope

(January 6, 1928)

VENERABLE BRETHREN, HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION,

Never perhaps in the past have the minds of men been so engrossed as they are to-day with the desire to strengthen and extend for the common good of mankind that tie of

brotherhood—the result of our common origin and nature—which binds us all so closely together. The world does not yet fully enjoy the fruits of peace; on the contrary, dissensions old and new in various lands still issue in rebellions and conflict. Such disputes, affecting the tranquil prosperity of nations, can never be settled without the combined and active goodwill of those who are responsible for their government, and hence it is easy to understand—especially now that the unity of mankind is no longer called into question—the widespread desire that all nations, in view of this universal kinship, should daily find closer union with one another.

It is with a similar motive that efforts are being made by some, in connexion with the New Law promulgated by Christ our Lord. Assured that there exist few men who are entirely devoid of the religious sense, they seem to ground on this belief a hope that all nations, while differing indeed in religious matters, may yet without great difficulty be brought to fraternal agreement on certain points of doctrine which will form a common basis of the spiritual life. With this object congresses, meetings, and addresses are arranged, attended by a large concourse of hearers, where all without distinction, unbelievers of every kind as well as Christians, even those who unhappily have rejected Christ and denied His divine nature or mission, are invited to join in the discussion. Now, such efforts can meet with no kind of approval among Catholics. They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy, inasmuch as all give expression, under various forms, to that innate sense which leads men to God and to the obedient acknowledgement of His rule. Those who hold such a view are not only in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favour this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God.

Nevertheless, when there is a question of fostering unity among Christians, it is easy for many to be misled by the apparent excellence of the object to be achieved. Is it not right, they ask, is it not the obvious duty of all who invoke the name of Christ to refrain from mutual reproaches and at last to be united in charity? Dare any one say that he loves Christ, and yet not strive with all his might to accomplish the desire of Him Who asked His Father that His disciples might be 'one' (John xvii. 21)? Did not Christ will that mutual charity should be the distinguishing characteristic of His disciples? 'By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another' (John xiii. 35). If only all Christians were 'one', it is contended, then they might do so much more to drive out the pest of irreligion which with its insidious and far-reaching advance is threatening to sap the strength of the Gospel. These and similar arguments, with amplifications, are constantly on the lips of the 'pan-Christians' who, so far from being a few isolated individuals, have formed an entire class and grouped themselves into societies of extensive membership, usually under the direction of non-Catholics, who also disagree in matters of faith. The energy with which this scheme is being promoted has won for it many adherents, and even many Catholics are attracted by it, since it holds out the hope of a union apparently consonant with the wishes of Holy Mother Church, whose chief desire it is to recall her erring children and to bring them back to her bosom. In reality, however, these fair and alluring words cloak a most grave error, subversive of the foundations of the Catholic faith.

Conscious, therefore, of Our Apostolic office, which warns Us not to allow the flock of Christ to be led astray by harmful fallacies, We invoke your zeal, Venerable Brethren, to avert this evil. We feel confident that each of you, by written and spoken word, will explain clearly to the people

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

the principles and arguments that We are about to set forth, so that Catholics may know what view and what course of action they should adopt regarding schemes for the promiscuous union into one body of all who call themselves Christians.

God, the Creator of all things, made us that we might know Him and serve Him; to our service, therefore, He has a full right. He might indeed have been contented to prescribe for man's government the natural law alone, that is, the law which in creation He has written upon man's heart, and have regulated the progress of that law by His ordinary Providence. He willed, however, to make positive laws which we should obey, and progressively, from the beginnings of the human race until the coming and preaching of Jesus Christ, He Himself taught mankind the duties which a rational creature owes to his Creator. 'God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by His Son' (Heb. i. 1, seq.). Evidently, therefore, no religion can be true save that which rests upon the revelation of God, a revelation begun from the very first, continued under the Old Law, and brought to completion by Jesus Christ Himself under the New. Now, if God has spoken—and it is historically certain that He has in fact spoken—then it is clearly man's duty implicitly to believe His revelation and to obey His commands. That we might rightly do both, for the glory of God and for our own salvation, the only-begotten Son of God founded His Church on earth. None, we think, of those who claim to be Christians will deny that a Church, and one sole Church, was founded by Christ.

On the further question, however, as to what in the intention of its Founder was to be the precise nature of that Church, there is not the same agreement. Many of them, for

example, deny that the Church of Christ was intended to be visible and manifest, at any rate in the sense that it was to be visibly the one body of the faithful, agreeing in one and the same doctrine under one teaching and governing authority. They conceive the visible Church as nothing more than a federation of the various Christian communities, even though these may hold different and mutually exclusive doctrines. The truth is that Christ founded His Church as a perfect society, of its nature external and perceptible to the senses, which in the future should carry on the work of the salvation of mankind under one head, with a living teaching authority, administering the sacraments which are the sources of heavenly grace (John iii. 5, vi. 48–59, xx. 22 seq.; cf. Matt. xviii. 18, &c.). Wherefore He compared His Church to a kingdom (Matt. xiii.), to a house (cf. Matt. xvi. 18), to a sheepfold (John x. 16), and to a flock (John xxi. 15–17). The Church thus wondrously instituted could not cease to exist with the death of its Founder and of the Apostles, the pioneers of its propagation; for its mission was to lead all men to salvation, without distinction of time or place: 'Going therefore, teach ye all nations' (Matt. xxviii. 19). Nor could the Church ever lack the effective strength necessary for the continued accomplishment of its task, since Christ Himself is perpetually present with it, according to His promise: 'Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world' (Matt. xxviii. 20). Hence not only must the Church still exist to-day and continue always to exist, but it must ever be exactly the same as it was in the days of the Apostles. Otherwise we must say—which God forbid—that Christ has failed in His purpose, or that He erred when He asserted of His Church that the gates of hell should never prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18).

And here it will be opportune to expound and to reject a certain false opinion which lies at the root of this question and of that complex movement by which non-Catholics seek

to bring about the union of Christian Churches. Those who favour this view constantly quote the words of Christ, 'That they may be one. . . . And there shall be one fold, and one shepherd' (John xvii. 21, x. 16), in the sense that Christ thereby merely expressed a desire or a prayer which as yet has not been granted. For they hold that the unity of faith and government which is a note of the one true Church of Christ has up to the present time hardly ever existed, and does not exist to-day. They consider that this unity is indeed to be desired and may even, by co-operation and goodwill, be actually attained, but that meanwhile it must be regarded as a mere ideal. The Church, they say, is of its nature divided into sections, composed of several churches or distinct communities which still remain separate, and although holding in common some articles of doctrine, nevertheless differ concerning the remainder; that all these enjoy the same rights; and that the Church remained one and undivided at the most only from the Apostolic age until the first Oecumenical Councils. Hence, they say, controversies and long-standing differences, which to-day still keep asunder the members of the Christian family, must be entirely set aside, and from the residue of doctrines a common form of faith drawn up and proposed for belief, in the profession of which all may not only know but also feel themselves to be brethren. If the various Churches or communities were united in some kind of universal federation, they would then be in a position to oppose resolutely and successfully the progress of irreligion.

Such, Venerable Brethren, is the common contention. There are indeed some who recognize and affirm that Protestantism has with inconsiderate zeal rejected certain articles of faith and external ceremonies which are in fact useful and attractive, and which the Roman Church still retains. But they immediately go on to say that the Roman Church, too, has erred, and corrupted the primitive religion

by adding to it and proposing for belief doctrines not only alien to the Gospel but contrary to its spirit. Chief among these they count that of the primacy of jurisdiction granted to Peter and to his successors in the See of Rome. There are actually some, though few, who grant to the Roman Pontiff a primacy of honour and even a certain power or jurisdiction; this, however, they consider to arise not from the divine law but merely from the consent of the faithful. Others, again, even go so far as to desire the Pontiff himself to preside over their mixed assemblies. For the rest, while you may hear many non-Catholics loudly preaching brotherly communion in Jesus Christ, yet not one will you find to whom it ever occurs with devout submission to obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his capacity of teacher or ruler. Meanwhile they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, as equals with an equal. But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would do so only on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the one fold of Christ.

This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give to such enterprises their encouragement or support. If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall we commit the iniquity of suffering the truth, the truth revealed by God, to be made a subject for compromise? For it is indeed a question of defending revealed truth. Jesus Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world to declare the faith of the Gospel to every nation, and, to save them from error, He willed that the Holy Ghost should first teach them all truth. Has this doctrine, then, disappeared, or at any time been obscured, in the Church of which God Himself is the ruler and guardian? Our Redeemer plainly said that His Gospel was intended not

only for the apostolic age but for all time. Can the object of faith, then, have become in the process of time so dim and uncertain that to-day we must tolerate contradictory opinions? If this were so, then we should have to admit that the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, the perpetual indwelling of the same Spirit in the Church, nay, the very preaching of Jesus Christ, have centuries ago lost their efficacy and value. To affirm this would be blasphemy. The only-begotten Son of God not only bade His representatives to teach all nations; He also obliged all men to give credence to whatever was taught them by 'witnesses preordained by God' (Acts x. 41). Moreover, He enforced His command with this sanction: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned' (Mark xvi. 16). These two commands, the one to teach, the other to believe for salvation, must be obeyed. But they cannot even be understood unless the Church proposes an inviolate and clear teaching, and in proposing it is immune from all danger of error. It is also false to say that, although the deposit of truth does indeed exist, yet it is to be found only with such laborious effort and after such lengthy study and discussion, that a man's life is hardly long enough for its discovery and attainment. This would be equivalent to saying that the most merciful God spoke through the prophets and through His only-begotten Son merely in order that some few men, and those advanced in years, might learn what He had revealed, and not in order to inculcate a doctrine of faith and morals by which man should be guided throughout the whole of his life.

These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the Churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideals in promoting charity among all Christians. But how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Every one knows that John himself, the Apostle of love, who seems in his Gospel to have revealed the secrets of the Sacred Heart of

Jesus, and who never ceased to impress upon the memory of his disciples the new commandment 'to love one another', nevertheless strictly forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt form of Christ's teaching: 'If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you' (2 John 10).

Therefore, since the foundation of charity is faith pure and inviolate, it is chiefly by the bond of one faith that the disciples of Christ are to be united. A federation of Christians, then, is inconceivable in which each member retains his own opinions and private judgement in matters of faith, even though they differ from the opinions of all the rest. How can men with opposite convictions belong to one and the same federation of the faithful: those who accept sacred Tradition as a source of revelation and those who reject it; those who recognize as divinely constituted the hierarchy of bishops, priests, and ministers in the Church, and those who regard it as gradually introduced to suit the conditions of the time; those who adore Christ really present in the Most Holy Eucharist through that wonderful conversion of the bread and wine, transubstantiation, and those who assert that the body of Christ is there only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the sacrament; those who in the Eucharist recognize both sacrament and sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial of the Lord's supper; those who think it right and useful to pray to the Saints reigning with Christ, especially to Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who refuse such veneration as derogatory to the honour due to Jesus Christ, 'the one mediator of God and men' (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 5)?

How so great a variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church, We know not. That unity can arise only from one teaching authority, one law of belief, and one

faith of Christians. But we do know that from such a state of affairs it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or 'indifferentism', and to the error of the modernists, who hold that dogmatic truth is not absolute but relative, that is, that it changes according to the varying necessities of time and place and the varying tendencies of the mind; that it is not contained in an immutable tradition, but can be altered to suit the needs of human life.

Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connexion with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between 'fundamental' and 'non-fundamental' articles, the former to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the free acceptance of the faithful. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal motive the authority of God revealing, and this allows of no such distinction. All true followers of Christ, therefore, will believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the august Trinity, the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the Oecumenical Vatican Council with the same faith as they believe the Incarnation of our Lord. That these truths have been solemnly sanctioned and defined by the Church at various times, some of them even quite recently, makes no difference to their certainty, nor to our obligation of believing them. Has not God revealed them all?

The teaching authority of the Church in the divine wisdom was constituted on earth in order that the revealed doctrines might remain for ever intact and might be brought with ease and security to the knowledge of men. This authority is indeed daily exercised through the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops who are in communion with him; but it has the further office of defining some truth with solemn decree whenever it is opportune, and whenever this is necessary either to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or again to impress the minds of the faithful with a clearer

and more detailed explanation of the articles of sacred doctrine. But in the use of this extraordinary teaching authority no fresh invention is introduced, nothing new is ever added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained within the deposit of Revelation divinely committed to the Church; but truths which to some perhaps may still seem obscure are rendered clear, or a truth which some may have called into question is declared to be of faith.

Thus, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics. There is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away. The one Church of Christ is visible to all, and will remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as He instituted it. The mystical Spouse of Christ has never in the course of centuries been contaminated, nor in the future can she ever be, as Cyprian bears witness: 'The Bride of Christ cannot become false to her Spouse; she is inviolate and pure. She knows but one dwelling, and chastely and modestly she guards the sanctity of the nuptial chamber' (*De Cath. Ecclesiae unitate*, 6). The same holy martyr marvelled that any one could believe that 'this unity of the Church built upon a divine foundation, knit together by heavenly sacraments, could ever be rent asunder by the conflict of wills' (ibid.). For since the mystical body of Christ, like His physical body, is one (1 Cor. xii. 12), compactly and fitly joined together (Eph. iv. 15), it were foolish to say that the mystical body is composed of disjointed and scattered members. Whosoever therefore is not united with the body is no member thereof, neither is he in communion with Christ its head.

Furthermore, in this one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize, and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors. Did not the ancestors of those who are now entangled in the errors of Photius and of the Reformers obey the Bishop of Rome, the chief shepherd of souls? Their children, alas! have left the home of their fathers; but that house did not therefore fall to the ground and perish for ever, for it was supported by God. Let them, then, return to their Father, Who, forgetting the insults in the past heaped upon the Apostolic See, will accord them a most loving welcome. If, as they constantly say, they long to be united with Us and Ours, why do they not hasten to enter the Church, 'the mother and mistress of all Christ's faithful'? (*Conc. Lateran*, iv, c. 5). Let them heed the words of Lactantius: 'The Catholic Church is alone in keeping the true worship. This is the fount of truth, this the house of faith, this the temple of God; if any man enter not here, or if any man go forth from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation. Let none delude himself with obstinate wrangling. For life and salvation are here concerned, and these will be lost for ever unless their interests be carefully and assiduously kept in mind' (*Divin. Inst.* lv. 30, 11–12).

Let our separated children, therefore, draw nigh to the Apostolic See, set up in the City which Peter and Paul, Princes of the Apostles, consecrated by their blood; to the See which is 'the root and womb whence issues the Church of God' (Cypr. *Ep.* 48 *ad Cornelium*, 3); and let them come, not with any intention or hope that 'the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth' (1 Tim. iii. 15) will cast aside the integrity of the faith and tolerate their errors, but to submit themselves to its teaching and government. Would that the happy lot, denied to so many of Our Predecessors, might at last be Ours, to embrace with fatherly affection those children whose unhappy separation from Us

We now deplore. Would that God our Saviour, 'Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth' (1 Tim. ii. 4), might hear our humble prayer and vouchsafe to recall to the unity of the Church all that are gone astray. To this all-important end We implore, and We desire that others should implore, the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of divine grace, Help of Christians, victorious over all heresies, that she may entreat for Us the speedy coming of that longed-for day, when all men shall hear the voice of her divine Son, and shall be 'careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' (Eph. iv. 3).

You, Venerable Brethren, know how dear to Our heart is this desire, and We wish that our children also should know, not only those belonging to the Catholic fold, but also those separated from Us. If these will humbly beg light from heaven, there is no doubt but that they will recognize the one true Church of Jesus Christ, and entering therein, will at last be united with Us in perfect charity. In the hope of this fulfilment, and as a pledge of our fatherly goodwill, We impart most lovingly to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at S. Peter's, Rome, on the 6th day of January, the Feast of the Epiphany of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year 1928, the sixth of Our Pontificate.

Pius PP. XI.

III. THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

114. Anglican Ordinations

Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Archbishop of Utrecht

(June 1925)

To the Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Greeting in the Lord.

We are in the happy position of being able to send good news to your Grace. The Old Catholic Church of Utrecht has hitherto been in doubt as to the validity of Anglican Orders. Its doubt concerned, not the fact of Parker's consecration, but the sufficiency of the rite of Edward VI as an adequate expression of the Catholic belief. After long inquiry and serious deliberation, and after consultation with our clergy, we have reached a decision which we hereby communicate to your Grace.

We believe that the Church of England has wished always to maintain the episcopal rule of the Church of antiquity, and that the Edwardine formula of consecration must be accounted valid. We therefore declare, without reservation, that the apostolic succession has not been broken in the Church of England.

Our prayers and greetings in the Lord.

(*Signed*) ✠ Francis Kenninck,
Archbishop of Utrecht.

Utrecht, *June* 2, 1925.

115. Anglican Ordinations

Letter to the Archbishop of Utrecht from the Archbishop of Canterbury

(July 1925)

To the Most Reverend Lord Francis Kenninck, Archbishop of Utrecht, Greeting ever in the Lord,

We have received your Lordship's letter informing us of the decision of the Old Catholic Church of Utrecht on the validity of Anglican Orders. Theologians of learning throughout the world will assuredly be deeply impressed by the fact that your Church, after long, careful, and accurate inquiry, no longer entertains doubt either as to the fact of Parker's consecration or as to the validity of the Edwardine formula of consecration. The same opinion, moreover, has lately been given in various ways by the Orthodox Eastern Church.

For our own part we are sure, and have always been sure, that the apostolical succession has never been broken in the Church of England, and that a valid formula of consecration has been continually maintained; but we give thanks to God for so signally demonstrating His will that His Church, so long rent asunder, should at length return to unity. The Old Catholic Church, which has suffered so much for the truth of the Catholic faith, commands, and has always commanded our veneration; and we rejoice that henceforward no cause of dissension will remain between us on either side, but that we shall be joined in the fellowship of the Word and sacraments as we ever have been in unity of heart.

As regards others, we can confidently say with St. Augustine: 'We are not alarmed about their differences of opinion

because our respect for St. Peter is equal to theirs; but we rejoice that they have remained in the Catholic Church, because we like them are built upon the rock.'

Greetings in our Lord and Saviour.

(*Signed*) RANDALL CANTUAR:

London, *July* 30, 1925.

116. Anglican Ordinations

STATEMENT BY THE CONFERENCE OF OLD CATHOLIC BISHOPS ASSEMBLED AT BERNE

(September 1925)

The Conference of Old Catholic Bishops united in the Convention of Utrecht, assembled in their session of September 2, 1925, at Berne, in taking notice of the acceptance of the Orders of the Church of England by the Church of Utrecht, fully stands to that decision, which corresponds to former declarations made by Old Catholic Bishops and savants of Germany and Switzerland, and gives expression to the fervent hope of a future more intimate and powerful contact with the Church of England and her daughter Churches on a truly Catholic basis.

By order of the Secretary of the Conference.

(*Signed*) BISHOP ADOLPH KÜRY, D.D.

Berne, *September* 2, 1925.

117. Relations with the Church of England

RESOLUTIONS OF THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF OLD CATHOLICS, BERNE

(September 1925)

1. The Congress is glad to be able to state that friendly relations with the Church of England have been renewed.

The question as regards the Apostolic Succession does not hinder a closer contact of both Churches, as the Church of England did not wish to interrupt that succession. The ordinal of King Edward VI can be accepted as a valid rite of ordination.

2. The Congress requests the supreme ecclesiastical authorities of all Old Catholic Churches to pass a general resolution regarding the validity of the Anglican rite of ordination.

IV. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES

FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OF JOINT CONFERENCE HELD AT LAMBETH PALACE, 1921–5

[The Documents which follow are a continuation of Nos. 40–47 in the first portion of this work. The whole series from 1921–5 was published in 1925 by the Oxford University Press, edited by G. K. A. Bell, Dean of Canterbury, and W. L. Robertson, Secretary of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. A narrative of the proceedings is given in No. 120 below. All the meetings of the Joint Conference, consisting of the two Archbishops and ten Bishops and twenty-five Free Church leaders and its sub-committee were held for the purpose not of negotiation, but of elucidation and explanation. The activities of the Joint Conference were suspended in 1925, 'in order that full opportunity may be given to the Churches represented on the Conference to study and understand the documents already submitted'. Any 'formal pronouncement on any scheme of union or proposals thereon' was deliberately left by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, 'to the authoritative Assemblies or Courts of the various Churches concerned.'

118. A Memorandum on A Constitutional Episcopate

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE
JULY 11, 1924

1. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches asked in 1922 among other things for a further elucidation of :

(i) What is meant by a representative and constitutional episcopate?

(ii) And how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it?

This topic was discussed by the Sub-Committee in 1922–3, but was laid aside for the moment in favour of another of

the topics requiring elucidation, viz. The Status of Free Church Ministries.

2. The meeting of the Federal Council had before it in 1923 the Report of the Committee on that subject and made its reply thereto. Subsequently it has been possible to take up again the topic which was adjourned before, to discuss it further, and to present the following report upon it.

3. The phrase 'representative and constitutional episcopate' we take to mean an episcopate which is exercised, not apart from, but in conjunction with other forms of ecclesiastical authority, and especially the authority resident in the presbyterate and the yet larger and more fundamental authority that resides in the Church as a whole as guided by the Spirit of God.

4. We agree in holding that Christ as living Head of His Church has given an authority to these jointly and not in isolation one from another. The records of the Early Church and especially the Acts of the Apostles show us this in the working: and it is a recovery of co-operation in fuller measure between the Episcopate, the Presbyterate, and the Body of the Faithful that the Lambeth Appeal wished to see.

5. At the same time the Anglican representatives call attention to the large measure of such co-operation which already exists in the Anglican Communion. It is more easily discerned in the non-established Anglican Churches than in the Church of England itself.

For example, in them the representative character of the Bishop is unmistakable, for he is chosen by the Synod, which itself rests upon the votes of the Clergy and the Church Members.

Again, in such Churches, the Bishop acts 'constitutionally'; for he has no legislative power apart from the Presbyters and the Laity. In his diocesan synod the most that he can do is to withhold his agreement to some decision made by the clergy and laity, and so suspend its

operation until appeal has been made to the final Church Authority.

In the provincial synod he is one among the other Bishops of the Province, and is limited by them.

In administration he is bound by the rules of the Church which defines his personal sphere of action. In discipline the same is the case, and in judicial proceedings he is often restricted constitutionally (as is the Crown) by the action or decision of his own officials. In choosing candidates for the Ministry he must take the call of the Church into account and in ordaining priests he acts with the Presbytery.

Even in England under the Establishment a great deal of this is true: and if the Bishop in England is in some ways less dependent on the co-operation of the faithful, in other respects his freedom of personal action is more circumscribed by the law than is the case with his brother Bishop in non-established Churches of the Anglican Communion.

We are all agreed, therefore, in recognizing the value of conciliar government and we agree that it may take many forms, e.g. synods, presbyteries, assemblies, and the like: and we deprecate the idea that the episcopate should be for the body an exclusive authority alone invested with the privilege and responsibility of government.

Equally we hold that the acceptance of the episcopate need not deprive any Church of any powers of government that it has exercised corporately or through its subordinate authorities, or through the congregations, provided that these powers do not impair the place which we have already[1] recognized as belonging to the Bishop in Ordination.

6. The second question, namely, how the element of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with

[1] See *Church Unity*, Document No. 44, ii. 7, 8 (*antea*).

the episcopate, invites a restatement of the position showing how far the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with the episcopate.

The Anglican representatives submit the following statement:

> In the Anglican system the presbyterate has its share in all legislation, the House of Clergy has the same suspending power as the Bishop or House of Bishops. Presbyters commonly act with the Bishop in graver matters of discipline; they share in ordination to the presbyterate (as has already been noted): they have their own minor assemblies and officers drawn from their own ranks, such as Archdeacons and Rural Deans, who under the Bishop have some administrative as well as consultative powers.
>
> The congregation is not debarred by any principle in the Anglican system from appointing its own minister. In England this power is seldom operative, but in other parts of the Anglican Church an effective voice is given to the congregation in the choice of its minister. But there is reserved to the Bishop or his deputy the right to institute to a cure of souls. Parochial Church Councils are now the elected and recognized representatives of the congregation, and already large powers and responsibilities have been entrusted to them.

We all agree in the hope that with an episcopate so related to the presbyterate and the congregation the convictions which we severally hold in regard to the nature of the Church and its ministry would be preserved.

7. Desiring, as we all do in the reunited Church of the future, the same spirit of freedom and order, diversity and unity as characterized the Church of Christ in the Apostolic age, and recognizing, as we all do, that the ministry is given by God *to* the Church, yet not *apart* from it, but *through* it, we believe that in the polity of the Church so united, Bishops,

Presbyters or Pastors, and Congregation should be associated as closely with one another in the testimony, worship and service of the Church as their diversity of function by the gift of the same Spirit allows. Recognizing also the continued guidance of the Church by her Head, we all believe that in each of the types of polity which has secured a permanent position in our different communions some element has been preserved which can be of value and service to the whole Church.[1]

119. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

Resolution adopted by the Annual Assembly September 16, 1924

The Council receives the Report and thanks the Committee for its work in connexion therewith.

In thus receiving the Report, the Council is not to be held committed (as it was not committed in connexion with former reports) to all the positions taken and the expressions used therein.

The Council appreciates the agreement in the Report that any polity possible for a united Church must combine episcopal, presbyteral and congregational elements, and further the recognition of the 'church' as the seat of 'the larger and more fundamental authority'.

The Council, however, feels that the Anglican position with regard to the method of the recognition of the congregational elements—as distinguished from the episcopal and presbyteral elements—in the polity of a united Church requires further elucidation.

In re-appointing its representatives, the Council thinks

[1] As the Federal Council has definitely referred the question of the relation of Church and State to the Sub-Committee, this question is reserved for further consideration. (See No. 125.)

it opportune, after a third year of the meetings in conference at Lambeth, to express the opinion that it is not in the interests of the unity movement itself that these conferences should be indefinitely prolonged. It suggests that those engaged in conference might at an early suitable opportunity gather together the general results which have been reached and present them for the consideration of the Churches concerned. The Council suggests that judgement on these interim reports should be suspended until some such general statement appears.

The Council, however, in saying this, does not mean to curtail whatever discussion the Committee may think still necessary of points not yet dealt with or completed. In particular the Council feels that the important memorandum presented by the Episcopal members on the subject of the Status of the Free Church Ministry is entitled to, and requires, further examination.

The Council is constrained once more to record its opinion that the discussing of points of unity between the Anglican Church and the Free Churches will always lack something of reality when it is unaccompanied by acts of more definite unity in Christian worship.

With these indications of its mind the Council reappoints its Committee.

120. A Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

JUNE 19, 1925

Five years have passed since the issue of the Appeal to All Christian People by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. During the whole of that time conversations have been held

or Conferences have been taking place between Bishops of the Church of England, and spokesmen of the Free Churches. We think that it may be of interest if, at this stage, in submitting the last of our replies to the questions which we have been asked to consider, we give a brief account of the course of the Proceedings.

The Joint Conference was formed in September 1921, following upon a Report entitled, 'The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal', when the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches appointed twenty-five Free Church representatives to confer with the two Archbishops and other members of the Church of England with regard to the Appeal. In May 1922 this Joint Conference published a Joint Report on Church Unity of great importance, consisting of a Preliminary Statement and a series of agreed propositions on 'The Nature of the Church', 'The Ministry', and 'The Place of the Creed in a United Church'. In the following September the Annual Assembly of the Federal Council, with this Joint Report before it, set out five practical difficulties which, in particular, remained to be considered, as follows:

1. What is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it;
2. The Status of the existing Free Church ministry;
3. The relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world;
4. The problems connected with the union between Church and State;
5. The safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

These practical difficulties have been discussed systematically by the Joint Conference, acting in the main through

the Sub-Committee, which has met at regular intervals ever since. In July 1923 the Church of England representatives presented a document of unusual significance in answer to the second of the above questions, entitled 'Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry'. This was received in September 1923 by the Federal Council, which adopted a series of considered Resolutions on the main positions of the document. In the summer of 1924 the Joint Conference issued a further Memorandum dealing with the first of the five questions quoted above, entitled 'Memorandum on a Constitutional Episcopate'. This document was in turn received and considered by the Federal Council in their Autumn Assembly last year. In receiving this Report the Federal Council, while not meaning to curtail discussion, suggested that the Conferences should not be 'indefinitely prolonged', and that those engaged in the discussions might 'at an early suitable opportunity gather together the general results which have been reached and present them for the consideration of the Churches concerned'.

The Joint Conference has this year completed its consideration of all the questions which it was definitely asked to consider, as well as certain points arising out of particular documents in the series. The Memoranda which it accordingly submits to the Federal Council are as follows:

(1) A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry; together with an Appended Note presented on behalf of the Free Church representatives on the Joint Conference.

(2) A Memorandum with reference to the question of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, viz. What is meant by a 'representative and constitutional' episcopate, and how the elements of presbyteral and congregational order may be combined with it.

(3) A Short Memorandum on the relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world.

(4) A Short Memorandum on the problems connected with the union between Church and State.

(5) A Short Memorandum on the safe-guarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

The Joint Conference believes that the time has now come when there might well be some suspension of its activities in order that full opportunity may be given to the Churches represented on the Conference to study and understand the documents already submitted. Every one of the Churches represented and connected with the Federal Council received a copy of the Appeal, officially transmitted to each by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1920. And it is with the cordial approval of the individual Free Churches that the Federal Council has up to this stage acted on their behalf for the purpose of elucidation and explication, deliberately leaving any 'formal pronouncement on any scheme of union or proposals thereon . . . to the authoritative Assemblies or Courts of the various Churches concerned'.

It is with profound and deliberate thankfulness that in putting forth this Statement, the last probably that we shall issue for the present, we look back along the intercourse, the deliberations, the work and the prayers of these eventful years. In a field of inevitable controversy we have, by the Blessing of God, attained a much larger measure of agreement than was thought by most people to be possible when our Conference began nearly four years ago. Much still remains to be considered, and ample time is required during which the questions we have carefully debated and the provisional conclusions we have reached will afford matter for prayer and thought and converse in the wider circles of our friends at home and overseas.

It is our special hope that the time will be occupied by

a consideration more careful than hitherto of the results of our labours on the part of the various denominations, extending throughout the world, to which the members of our Conference belong. But though for this reason we think that our deliberations ought, for the present, to be suspended, we trust that they will not be regarded as concluded; and, if it is desired, the Joint Conference and the Sub-Committee are willing to hold themselves in readiness at any time to consider any further matters which may be referred to them.

May the Holy Spirit, to whose aid we have looked in our deliberations, vouchsafe to those on whose behalf we have tried to act and speak the wisdom and understanding, the counsel and strength which will make fruitful our contribution to the growth and security of the wider unity for which we pray.

RANDALL CANTUAR:
COSMO EBOR:
J. SCOTT LIDGETT, *Moderator of the Federal Council.*

121. A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry

PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REPRESENTATIVES ON THE JOINT CONFERENCE, TOGETHER WITH AN APPENDED NOTE FROM THE FREE CHURCH MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONFERENCE

JUNE 19, 1925

In a series of resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly on September 18, 1923, the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England commented on the memorandum on the status of the existing Free Church Ministries prepared by the Anglican representatives of the Joint Con-

ference meeting at Lambeth, and requested its own representatives to confer further on this matter. In the course of these further Conferences, we, the Anglican representatives, were requested to write some rejoinder to these resolutions which could be incorporated with them in the documents of the Joint Conference. In accordance with this request we submit the following Memorandum:

I. It is perhaps well at the outset for the sake of clearness and the prevention of misunderstandings to recall what was said in our first Memorandum, namely, that the Free Church ministries, which we regard as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church, are such ministries as are in some real measure given and exercised in accordance with the principles set forth in the first report of our Joint Conference.[1]

II. Even with regard to such ministries the Resolutions of the Federal Council seem to us to assume too readily that because the Word is admitted to be Christ's Word, and the Sacraments to be Christ's Sacraments, no further questions can rightly be raised as to the sufficiency of the Word preached or the Sacraments administered or of the ministers thereof. But such questions are inevitable.[2] Can it be claimed of any Word preached, of any Sacrament administered, of any ministry, that it is in perfect accord with Christ's mind and will? There are many grounds and degrees of imperfection. As to these each Church must judge in accordance with its own beliefs about the mind and will of Christ and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. In the exercise of the discipline which is involved in its corporate life, it must needs make decisions as to where it draws the line of allowance or disallowance in regulating its own practice or estimating the practice of others. It cannot accept a mere intention, however sincere, to preach the Word as Christ's

[1] See *Church Unity*, Document No. 44 (*antea*).
[2] See Document No. 44, The Report, I. 10 and II. 7.

Word, or to administer the Sacraments as Christ's Sacraments as sufficient without any further questions. It must guard the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments for the sake of its own members, and in loyalty to its own conception of truth. Thus in our judgement it does not follow that because certain ministries are admitted to be real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments, they must thereby be considered as in themselves sufficient.

III. These considerations affect the question of the authority of the ministry. Spiritual efficacy is one thing, due authority is another. The latter is not involved in the former. The full admission which we have most readily made in accordance with the spirit and terms of the Lambeth Appeal to all Christian people, that the ministries we are considering possess spiritual reality and efficacy, does not carry with it the admission that they have due authority. And this matter of due authority is to us one of the highest importance. We rejoice that in the first report of our Conference all its members unanimously agreed that the episcopate should be accepted for the united Church of the future, as the means whereby the authority to the whole body should be given to the ministry. But we regard this bestowal of the authority of the whole body to the Ministry by Episcopal Ordination not merely as something which is desirable for the united Church of the future, but as something which 'from the Apostles' time' has always been provided for the Church. We see in this provision a token of the guidance of the Church by the Holy Spirit and of the Divine purpose. We regard the acceptance of it as a trust to which the Anglican Church is called to be faithful. We believe that the refusal of it, however natural at certain periods of Church history, has been responsible for many of the divisions of Christendom in the past, and that indifference to it ought not to mark any steps which may be taken in

the endeavour to restore the broken unity of the Church in the future.

IV. It is true, as the resolutions of the Federal Council point out, that in the confused times of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exceptions to the rule requiring Episcopal Ordination for Ministry in the Church of England sometimes occurred. But the Resolutions admit that these cases were exceptional. They form a very insecure basis of precedent. And it must be remembered that the aim of our present conferences arising, as they do, out of the Lambeth Appeal is different from, and wider than, the aim of arrangements which may sometimes have been made to meet the difficulties of troubled times in the past history of the Church of England. For our endeavour is not merely to meet difficulties and restore unity in our own country, but to do this in such a way as may form a basis for still wider union throughout the world. However remote the attainment of such an ideal may seem, we are responsible for seeing that nothing which we do now will create a new obstacle to that attainment.

V. Here, then, we reach the heart of the problem which confronts us. On the one hand the Anglican Church requires that no one can exercise his ministry in its own congregations who has not received Episcopal Ordination. On the other hand, many—it may be most—of our Free Church brethren would be unwilling not only to receive such Ordination, but also to promote any scheme of union which required it. Is the mere statement of the difficulty the last word that can be said about it? We who represent the Anglican Church in this Conference feel ourselves to be under a constraint, both of mind and heart, to do all we can to overcome it consistently with loyalty to our principles and to our ideals of Christian unity.

VI. Before going further we think it well to call attention to the narrow limits within which so far as our own dis-

cussions are concerned the difficulty will exist. We do so not for the sake of those who have taken part in these discussions, but for the sake of the wider public who may read the records of them. It must be remembered that in these conferences we are not dealing with Free Churchmen who reject the whole idea of Episcopal Ordination. On the contrary, our Free Church colleagues have agreed with us that while the elements of Presbyteral and Congregational Order should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the united Church of the future, the Episcopate ought to be accepted as the means whereby the authority of the whole body shall be given to the Ministry.[1] The difficulty would occur only as to the position of existing Free Church ministries within the period between the adoption of a scheme of union and its completion by all the ministers of the uniting Churches possessing a common authority through Episcopal Ordination.

VII. The question which we desire to consider, and which we desire the Church to which we belong to consider, is whether, within that period some modification may be possible of the present requirement of full and unconditional Episcopal Ordination. It will be understood that any suggestions which we, who present this Memorandum, venture to make are made solely on our own responsibility. They are made without authority, most tentatively, and only in order that (to use a prevalent mode of speech) every approach to a solution may be explored. We note first the words of the Lambeth Conference Committee on Reunion already quoted in our former Memorandum, that 'when a scheme of union has in any place been adopted situations will arise in which we should all agree that new lines of action may be followed'. We note secondly that the Lambeth Appeal expresses the hope that in such an event

[1] See Document No. 44, The Report, II. 8; cf. II. 9.

ministers who have not received it would accept 'a commission through Episcopal Ordination', and adds that in so doing no one could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry, but would only be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in the reunited Church. Is there any way by which such a commission through Episcopal Ordination could be given, and by which, at the same time, the understanding that no repudiation of past ministries was involved could be made plain? We venture to offer two suggestions for the consideration of the Anglican Church and of the Free Churches represented in the Federal Council.

VIII. (1) Inasmuch as the main stress of the Lambeth Appeal is laid on securing due authority for the ministry, and inasmuch as the lack of this authority is, in our judgement, the main defect in the Free Church ministries which we are considering, we ask, might not a solemn authorization be conferred by the laying on of hands by a Bishop? It might be prefaced by explanatory words, by prayer, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and it might be expressed in some such form as this: 'Take thou Authority, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, for the office and work of a Priest (or Presbyter). And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' We believe that such a proposal would commend itself to many of our Free Church brethren, and we think it is worthy of the careful consideration of our own Church.

But we cannot deny that it is open to many serious objections. There would be some doubt as to the exact nature of the authority which was conferred, whether it was an authority of order or only of jurisdiction. There would be the disadvantage of a solemn formula being used in a wider sense by those who spoke it, and in a more

restricted sense by those over whom it was spoken. Any ambiguity might give rise to hesitation and misgiving in the minds of many faithful members of the Anglican Church, and thereby hinder the cordial acceptance of the authority thus conferred. Its sufficiency might be questioned by other Episcopal Churches. We think that a second plan which we venture to suggest would be less open to such objections.

IX. (2) It is Ordination *sub conditione*—an act of Episcopal Ordination prefaced and governed by a condition expressed in some such words as 'If thou art not already Ordained'. These words would be followed by the form or Ordination and Authorization in the Ordinal of the Church of England. But the whole of the service therein set forth need not be used. There would simply be an act supplementing the existing ministries by the essentials of Ordination, and this *sub conditione*. It seems to us that this plan would have the merit of dealing straightforwardly with the actual facts of the situation. It would recognize, as a matter of fact, that there *is* a doubt on one side; it would not require or involve any acknowledgement of the validity of that doubt from the other side. It would be following a practice which has long been familiar in the Church with regard to the Sacrament of Baptism. Where there is a doubt as to the evidence of the fact of Baptism, or as to the use of the essential parts (baptism with water and in the name of the Holy Trinity) the Sacrament need not be reiterated but may be administered conditionally. The same practice, though less commonly, has been used with regard to Ordination. There are precedents for it in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference recommend its use in certain cases even of Episcopal Ordination.

This plan would not, we think, be open to the objections which we felt bound to mention with regard to the first

plan submitted for consideration. There would be no ambiguity as to its purpose. The person thus conditionally Ordained would simply, we repeat, be acknowledging as a fact the existence of a doubt in the mind of the Ordaining authority without necessarily implying that he himself admitted its validity. The Ordaining authority would simply give whatever in its judgement had hitherto been wanting. Any discrimination between the circumstances of the previous Ordination of this or that particular minister would be unnecessary. All would be treated in the same way. There would be more probability of the Ordination being confidently accepted by all members of the Anglican Church, and of other Episcopal Churches.

X. If either of these suggestions were adopted, then the present invariable requirement of the Anglican Church that those who have not received Episcopal Ordination must be Ordained *simpliciter*, without any condition, would be suspended during the period which we are considering. It would be for the United Church to make its own regulations for the future. Our Free Church brethren will recognize that this involves a very real change in the practice of the Anglican Church. We do not know whether it would be sanctioned by the authorities of that Church. But we who present this Memorandum believe that the suggestions we have ventured to make, especially the second, are not inconsistent with the principles, history, or position in Christendom of the Anglican Church. The Resolutions of the Federal Council say: 'The question of Ordination is the place where we look to the Anglican Church to meet their Free Church brethren'. In these suggestions we have gone as far as we rightly can go to meet them. We hope that they will regard them in the same spirit. We ask both the Anglican Church and the Free Churches to consider whether they may not form a bridge between two apparently opposed positions. With the Federal Council 'we ask no immediate

or premature answer. We believe that God's guidance of us all in this matter has not ended.' We pray that the Holy Spirit of truth and unity who has already—as we humbly believe—led us to a measure of agreement which once would have seemed impossible may continue to guide our hearts and minds.

APPENDED NOTE

From the Free Church Members of the Joint Conference

We have now had fuller opportunity of considering this important Memorandum, which we have done with respect and care, and we desire to make the following *interim* statement regarding it.

1. We heartily appreciate the spirit in which the Memorandum is written and we receive it as an expression of a sincere desire on the part of the Anglican members of the Joint Conference to make an advance towards meeting their Free Church brethren on the difficult and crucial issue, which from the very beginning of these negotiations we have regarded as primary and vital.
2. It is not within our present responsibility to pass judgement, in the name of the Free Churches, upon the alternative suggestions made in the Memorandum, nor is it desirable that we should attempt to do so. These suggestions must be considered in due course by the Federal Council. Meantime, they should be studied not with the view of immediate acceptance or rejection, but with the earnest desire to explore all possible ways by which this problem can be met, with due regard alike to the ecclesiastical principle and to the practical situation on either side.

3. Noting, however, as we do, the preference given in the Memorandum to the proposal of 'Ordination *sub conditione*', we feel that it would be less than candid if we did not say that, whatever may be the view taken of this by individuals among us, we are unable to hold out to our Anglican brethren any prospect of its being found adequate or acceptable by the Federal Council or by the Free Churches. We say this solely that our brethren may be under no misapprehension as to the situation.
4. For our own part, we feel that the solution of this question might be sought along lines which (*a*) confer an 'extended commission' mutually and not from one side only, and (*b*) indicate unambiguously an 'extended commission' and not an ordination. This is also the view which has been maintained in negotiations over the Lambeth Appeal in Canada and India (*vide* Dean Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity*, pp. 263–7, 312–17). We record this because, as we have said, every possible way of meeting the problem should be before the minds of all of us.
5. We venture to think that it is not advisable that the Sub-Committee should immediately pursue the discussion of these or any other proposals in this matter to an issue; and we take it from the closing words of the Memorandum that this is also the view of our Anglican brethren. We engage to continue to give their suggestions full and careful consideration and to secure such consideration for them by those whom we represent. We believe that God, who has led us through so many difficulties up to now, will still guide us if we are faithful to the Spirit alike of Truth and of Charity.

122. A Memorandum by the Bishop of Truro and the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., with reference to the question, 'What is meant by a Representative and Constitutional Episcopate, and how the Elements of Presbyteral and Congregational Order may be combined with it'

GENERALLY APPROVED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE[1]

JUNE 19, 1925

I. The Conference has already expressed its agreement that a non-episcopal Church in accepting episcopacy 'might retain a very large measure of self-government according to its previous methods', and in the Memorandum of July 11, 1924, we attempted to show how the acceptance of the episcopate might be combined with the elements of presbyteral and congregational order. We now desire to venture a step further with some more detailed suggestions as to the possible working of a scheme for a group of Churches uniting on such lines. The way was marked out in the Lambeth Appeal, where it spoke first of 'Terms of Union' to be settled at the outset, and then of a procedure with regard to the ministry. Two alternative methods for this have been set out in the Anglican Memorandum of June 19, 1925,[2] and now, assuming some such method as adopted, we can pass on to forecast in outline the subsequent working out of it, presumably in an *interim* period (of longer or shorter length), which will be necessary before the uniting churches can be ready to attain to the ultimate goal of organic reunion.

Such forecasting is hazardous work; but we seem to have reached the point where imagination may legitimately lend its aid to faith and hope: and where we may meet the

[1] This 'forecast in outline' was not formally adopted by the Joint Conference, but sent forward to the Federal Council with its general approval.—*Ed.*

[2] No. 121, p. 77 *antea*.

common objection, 'The thing is unworkable—inconceivable!' by saying, 'Why should it not conceivably work out somewhat as follows?'

II. Each non-episcopal denomination, when it had decided through its own proper authorities to come into the scheme, would itself choose those whom, as its representatives, it desired to have consecrated as bishops. These would be presented for acceptance to the Metropolitan of the Anglican province concerned, and he, acting with his comprovincial bishops, would consecrate them direct to the episcopate, using either the Anglican rite or some other form which had been adopted as an alternative to it for use in the Uniting Churches.

III. The method by which the candidates for consecration were chosen would be left for decision to each denomination, provided that it was made clear that the call of the Church to the man and his own inner sense of call coincided in making plain the call of God.

IV. Each bishop so consecrated would exercise authority only over those ministers and congregations of his own denomination which were assigned to him by it, and under such conditions as it should determine. For convenience sake, it would be well if (in England at least) the assignment should be made on territorial lines, and should take account of the existing territorial areas of the Anglican provinces and dioceses.

Each bishop, whether taking charge of an Anglican or a Free Church group, would have no immediate jurisdiction over those of another group, but only such authority as the bishop in charge of it might delegate to him; and in any important matter it would be advisable that this should be done formally by a definite Commission.

V. After this consecration the new bishop, associated with presbyters and other ministers, would offer to the ministers of his jurisdiction an opportunity of supplementing the

ordination that had been previously conferred on each of them by receiving in some brief form a 'conditional ordination', or whatever other equivalent may be agreed upon, as the way of 'obtaining for them a ministry (accepted) throughout the whole fellowship'.

Each man who availed himself of that opportunity would be welcomed to minister the Word and Sacraments in all Churches and congregations of the uniting denominations, when licensed to do so both by the bishop of his own denomination and by the bishop of those to whom he ministered.

Those who did not avail themselves of such opportunities (during the period in which, by agreement, they were offered) would not have the right to administer the Holy Communion to Anglican congregations, nor yet to those of any other denomination unless it is decided otherwise. But they should have full right, as being ministers of one or other of the uniting denominations, to conduct other services, and to preach, in other churches than their own, if licensed thereto by the bishop of the church in question.

All those episcopally ordained, whether before the scheme or after it, or else *sub conditione* during the inauguration of the scheme, would equally be entitled to receive a call or appointment to any charge or cure within any of the united Churches; but if he were to be transferred from one of them to another, a permission from the bishop of each church concerned would be necessary for the transference.

VI. Having dealt thus in outline with the first steps of the uniting Churches, we come now to forecast the continuous working of the scheme during the *interim* period, and the co-ordination of the different church polities of the uniting Churches under one central assembly.

We envisage the situation somewhat as follows: Each parish, local church, or congregation would form part of an administrative unit over which a bishop would preside.

Areas would be arranged so that each unit had its own local boundaries, but everywhere there would be several co-existing jurisdictions—Anglican, Wesleyan, Congregationalist, and so forth. As far as possible the local boundaries should coincide, e.g. a county such as Somersetshire, Cornwall or Durham would easily form not only an Anglican diocese (as at present) but also an area common to three or four Free Church bishops, presiding each over his own denomination therein.

Each unit then would be in threefold connexion with other units: (*a*) denominationally, i.e. with the other units of its own denomination; (*b*) territorially, i.e. with the other denominations of its own region or area; (*c*) centrally, with all other units grouped together in a central assembly, which would cover whatever comprehensive region was found to be most manageable, such as, for example, a country, a Dominion, a colony, a mission field, or the like.

VII. (*c*) We may look a little more closely in turn, but in reverse order, at each of these. The new Central Assembly ought to be fully representative of bishops, clergy, and laity of all the uniting Churches. It is probable that it should have more than a consultative authority. It should be able to legislate on behalf of the whole group of uniting Churches. But due provision should be made that, in legislating, the constituent Churches, as well as each House—bishops, clergy, and laity—should vote separately. Legislation should only be effected by the requisite majority of each House and of each constituent Church. Also it would be best that for any change in the original Terms of Union, either by alteration or addition, a bare majority should not be sufficient.

The Central Assembly should also act as a Court of Appeal or Arbitration upon any matters referred to it, either by one of the denominational assemblies, or by one of the regional councils.

The details would need to be worked out with great care;

but, for the purposes of this very slender sketch, it is enough to say that the Central Assembly should include all the bishops, together with a full and proportionate representation of the clergy and laity of all the constituent Churches.

The ministers of all the uniting denominations should be recognized as of equal status in all councils and assemblies of the uniting Churches, including those not episcopally ordained.

VIII. (*b*) It is in the regional areas that the clash of jurisdictions will be most felt; and there plans must be devised for harmonious working. History provides very little precedent for several concurrent, co-extensive, and co-operating episcopal jurisdictions. Normally the rule has prevailed, 'One area, one bishop'; and the emergence of two bishops of the same area has meant schism, or, at least, rivalry. But this problem might be solved by recognizing that each of the bishops in the area had authority over persons and congregations, rather than over the area itself. At the same time, the bishops of the area, acting collectively as a college, might in some matters come to exercise a joint supervision extending over all the congregations contained in it.

And happily there are some precedents for such a plan, at least, as an *interim* measure, and leading up to the recovery of the old rule of 'One area, one bishop', on which orderliness must ultimately depend in any episcopally led Church. The healing of the Donatist schism in Africa, for example, was brought about through tolerating the co-existence of two bishops and two jurisdictions in one area, until such time as all the congregations could agree to coalesce under one.

Meanwhile, the regional Councils would present great opportunities for organizing common work, for reducing the waste caused by undesirable competition, for effecting economy, or better distribution of man-power both in home

work and overseas; and, more important than all, for recovering the spirit of fellowship, and manifesting afresh to the world the solid Christian witness of a United Church.

All this would show itself in practical comity with regard to evangelistic and pastoral work as well as in ministrations to special classes. It would also conduce to the settlement of difficult questions, educational, social, and moral, affecting the public life of the community.

Any interdenominational question or dispute could be settled by the regional Council, which should be a local counterpart of the Central Assembly, and if settlement were not satisfactorily reached there, it would go up to the Central Assembly for decision.

IX. (*a*) The organization of the different denominational units in their one common denomination need not differ, we suppose, from what already exists, except in so far as it is modified by the acceptance of the Terms of Union. The powers of the bishop need not be identical in different denominations, except in so far as the Terms of Union may reserve some functions to the bishop, notably ordination and probably confirmation. The same variety would be kept as to the choice and call of a man into the ministry, the minister's appointment to a particular charge or cure, or his removal from it. To the minister probably would be reserved by the Terms of Union, the administration of Holy Communion, and (except in case of urgency) of Holy Baptism, and the official act of absolving and blessing in the Church's name. But otherwise his action would be regulated by the denominational authorities whatever they might be.

X. It may be anticipated that the uniting denominations would during this interim period retain their financial independence, and their present arrangements as to buildings, property, and the like. In course of time some transference of clergy and ministers might entail some readjust-

ments, and some transference of buildings might involve some variation of trusts; but we do not anticipate that these matters would be difficult. Any joint handling of financial questions could thus be deferred till a later stage, as common life in one communion brought the constituent bodies closer to one another, and disseminated not only the brotherly spirit, but also the businesslike knowledge needed for any further stages of financial unification.

In other respects, too, the ancient customs of the denomination would prevail. Three points may be specially mentioned by way of example:

The foreign relations of each denomination would remain as they are: each would have power to remain in communion with other Churches lying outside the scheme at its own discretion. But this would not bind the others. They would decide also, each on its own responsibility; and intercommunion with one would not imply intercommunion with all. The freedom in worship of each denomination would be retained—subject only to such restrictions as the Terms of Union might entail. The laity would not be very directly touched by any of the developments here outlined: their position, privileges, and duties would be conserved. They would remain under the discipline of their own denomination.

XI. This outline has in view mainly the English problem of the reunion of the English Church with the English Evangelical Churches which are represented in our Lambeth meetings. But the wider problem of the position overseas and of the missionary areas has not been left altogether out of sight: nor must the oecumenical aspect of Reunion be forgotten if we would be faithful to the purpose of our Saviour.

But for the moment this very tentative Memorandum will provide more than enough for consideration and discussion.

123. A Short Memorandum on the Relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in Fellowship in other parts of the World

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE
JUNE 19, 1925

We have contemplated that after preliminary negotiations have been completed between Churches desiring to enter into closer union there would be a period, short or long, during which each Church would retain a large measure of distinctiveness in its life and government. During this period it may be assumed that the relations between each Church and other Churches in other parts of the world would continue to be much as they are now. Any arrangements which one or more of the Free Churches in England might make as to the adoption of the Episcopate in the manner suggested in the memorandum on that subject would probably not be regarded by Churches elsewhere as disturbing their existing communion. If any questions arose —for example, as to the admission of ministers or members from other Churches—which were likely to cause difficulties in the fellowship of the uniting Churches, they would, it is assumed, be referred for settlement to the Central Council of these uniting Churches which we have had in view.

If this period were to issue in closer and organic union, questions as to the relation between the United Church and other Churches hitherto in communion with its constituent parts would be determined by the final terms of union.

A situation would then have been reached so different from that which now exists, that it would seem to be premature to attempt now to forecast what arrangements might then be made.

124. A Short Memorandum on the Problems connected with the Union between Church and State

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE
JUNE 19, 1925

The discussions at the meetings of the Conference and of the Sub-Committee have dealt particularly with outstanding questions that concern the relations between the Episcopal and the non-Episcopal Churches, and it has been impossible to enter fully into the questions that affect the relations of the Church to the State. Nor indeed is it possible to deal fully at the present time with a situation that is constantly changing. At the time of reunion it is clear that many problems would arise both in the ecclesiastical and in the civil spheres, and would have to be settled severally by the uniting Churches and the State, none of the Churches represented in the present Conferences being committed now to any particular solution.

I. From the Free Church point of view it may be said—Two guiding principles it seems possible now to lay down:

(1) That the Church should enjoy complete autonomy in the discharge of all its spiritual functions.

(2) That the Church should be free to bring its highest and utmost possible influence to the service of the State in promoting the well-being of the people, and in bearing its witness to the authority of Christian principles in the affairs of the State.

II. From the Anglican point of view it may be said:

(1) The relations between the Church of England and the State have been and are being greatly modified by the system inaugurated by the Enabling Act. It is possible that in regard to Ecclesiastical Courts proposals may be adopted which would more fully safeguard the spiritual authority of the Church.

(2) Many Churches of the Anglican Communion have now no special connexion with the State.

(3) No member of the Church of England would regard what is called 'Establishment' as involving any principle essential to the life of the Church.

Those who value 'Establishment'—for the sake of the Church as giving it a special association with and responsibility for the life of the English nation, for the sake of the State as expressing its religious character—would probably be unwilling to bring it to an end for the sake of any union with some of their fellow Christians in England, which would only be very partial as regards either its scope or the numbers involved. Their view would certainly be greatly affected if there were the prospect of any really large or permanent union.

Thus, suppose one of the Free Churches in England entered into negotiations with the Church of England with a view to a new spiritual fellowship, and during what we have in these discussions called the interim period (when each Church would retain much of its own distinctive life and government) the Church of England desired to retain its connexion with the State, it might be hoped that the Free Church would not regard this as a bar to the spiritual fellowship desired.

Suppose this period resulted in a wish for a full organic union, then the question of relationship with the State would be determined by the final terms of union. If the union thus contemplated embraced a large majority of English Christians, then on the one hand the Church of England might be unwilling to press the continuance of its 'Establishment', if this proved to be a fatal obstacle to union; and on the other hand the Free Churches might be willing to reconsider their attitude in view of the prospect of a really national Church, and the State on its part might be willing to alter the character and incidents of Establish-

ment. Here again a new situation would arise wholly different from the present, which would make a reconsideration of the problem on all sides possible and indeed inevitable.

125. A Short Memorandum on the Safeguarding of the Evangelical Principles of the Reformation

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT CONFERENCE
JUNE 19, 1925

While this question is one of very great importance, it does not seem to us that it can be profitably considered at the present stage of our discussions. The primary object of our Conferences has been to consider together the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference to All Christian People with a view to the elucidation of what it says and what it involves. In that Appeal the Conference was content to suggest a threefold basis on which a United Church might be built up. This threefold basis was:

'The whole-hearted acceptance of:

(1) 'The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:

(2) 'The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ:

(3) 'A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.'

It is on this basis that the present Conferences have been carried on, and we for our part cannot contemplate any further discussions dealing with doctrine or ceremony which would not be on the same basis.

126. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

Resolutions adopted by the Annual Assembly September 21–3, 1925

I

The Council receives the Report, without thereby being committed, any more than in previous years, to all the statements and opinions contained therein. In so doing, it thanks the Anglican representatives on the Joint Committee for the care, conciliation, and candour with which they have considered and replied to the questions submitted on behalf of the Free Churches.

II

The Council concurs in the opinion given in the Report, and approved by the Anglican representatives and its own, that it is desirable to bring to a pause the conferences which have been taking place, in order that the various documents issued by the Joint Committee and the positions agreed on or proposed may be more deliberately considered by the Churches concerned and by the Christian mind of the country. In concurring in this, the Council expresses its deep thankfulness for the spirit of unbroken friendliness which has prevailed throughout the whole proceedings of the Joint Committee for four years; and it desires to make clear that such suspension of formal meetings at Lambeth is not to be taken to mean any rupture in this friendly relationship, or any closing of the door against the resump-

tion of conference when God's Spirit may seem to invite to this step.

III

In view of the termination of the present series of conferences the Council discharges the Committee. It resolves to appoint a Committee of Reference on the Lambeth Appeal (to be nominated by the Standing Committee) to elucidate any points of inquiry which may arise, and generally to watch over the situation, but without power to resume formal conference till so authorized by the Council.

IV

In view, further, of the termination of these conferences, the Council, for the information of the Churches which it represents, may fitly at this stage recall and briefly comment on the main positions regarding faith and order which have been explored by the Joint Committee. It will suffice to mention, at present, four topics:

(i) The large measure of agreement between the Churches concerned on vital and fundamental matters of *faith* is to be recognized, valued, and emphasized. On the strength of this alone, the Free Churches declare their readiness to join with their Anglican brethren not only in moral and social, but also in religious and evangelical work wherever possible.

(ii) On the issue of *polity*, the Joint Committee was agreed that an episcopacy, not of its present character, but of a 'constitutional' character, should be an essential element in the order of the United Church, place being 'similarly' given to elements of presbyteral and congregational order as equally essential elements; and this proposal is to be taken not in one part of it only, but in its entirety. Suggestions as to how a 'constitutional episcopate' can be reconciled with the presbyteral and congregational elements are made in memoranda accompanying this Report,

but it is important to notice that neither the Joint Committee nor the Council is committed to these details.

(iii) On the matter of *recognition*, regarding which the Free Church representatives have from the first meeting at Lambeth desired some declaration of the Anglican view, special note should be taken of the following statement made by the Anglican representatives in their first memorandum on the 'Status of the Free Church Ministry':

'It seems to us to be in accord with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Churches concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.' (Dean Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 159.) [1]

This explicit and considered recognition of these non-episcopally ordained ministries as (*a*) evangelical, (*b*) sacramental, and (*c*) not schismatic but within the Church—whatever further questions as to the extent of their 'authorization' may be subsequently raised—is to be welcomed; and, if its significance is fully recognized, and if practical effect is given to its terms, it should mark a stage in the whole discussion between the Anglican and the Free Churches, and will prove a valuable basis for further progress if and when conferences are resumed.

(iv) It must, however, be observed that, on this subsequent question of *authorization* the Anglican representatives seem still inclined, despite the declaration above quoted, to insist that Free Church ministers accept ordination—at least in the form known as *sub conditione*—at episcopal hands. The Free Church representatives on the Joint Committee intimated that there is, in their view, little or no

[1] See Document No. 46, *antea*.

prospect of this being accepted by any non-episcopal Church. With this view the Council agrees; and it takes leave to say that it would deeply regret if the fortunes of the Lambeth Appeal, so far as non-episcopal Christendom is concerned, were finally bound up with a proposal so unconvincing and so unpromising as that of requiring the ordination to the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Church of men explicitly acknowledged to be in that very ministry. The question of authorization must be answered by some other means than ordination. It is, therefore, to be noted with satisfaction that the Anglican memorandum does not exclude the alternative method of a 'commission' which shall be (*a*) mutual and (*b*) unambiguously not an ordination. This is the line which is being followed wherever to-day union between Churches is being achieved. It should, however, be recognized that on this question the Anglican Church has peculiar difficulties to consider; and the issue is one which, therefore, is not to be pressed to an immediate decision. (There are other matters of high importance in the report and its accompanying memoranda, but these, having been less fully dealt with, need not be referred to here.)

V

In conclusion, the Council, reviewing the whole of the conversations which have taken place—which have been carried on for a much longer period and in a far more conciliatory spirit than in any previous meetings between Conformity and Nonconformity in England—records its assurance that these conferences have done much to bring representative members of the Churches concerned into closer fellowship and to a better understanding of each other's position; and, further, that they have prepared the way to further progress towards unity in the future. To avoid any misunderstanding, it may be well to state that

the discussions have been in no sense negotiations for reunion, but have been intended simply to elucidate the meaning of the Lambeth Appeal and to indicate on what lines reunion, if desired, might possibly be effected. Believing that the Spirit of God is, in these days, manifestly drawing more closely together all who name the Name of Christ as Lord and Saviour, and impressed with the urgent call to unity in face of the moral and religious problems of the world, the Council anew commends the whole matter to the mind and heart and conscience of Christian people, particularly the people of the Churches which it represents. And it prays that grace and mercy and peace from our Lord Jesus Christ may be with the brethren with whom it has been in conference, with the great Church which they represent, and with the whole Church of God.

FURTHER RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL ADOPTED BY THE FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLIES

(Following upon those adopted on the first issue of the Appeal to All Christian People by the Lambeth Conference, 1920.)

127. The Baptist Union

Reply to the Appeal to All Christian People adopted by the Annual Assembly, May 4, 1926

We, the representatives of Churches in membership with the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, gathered in Annual Assembly, greet in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ all Christian people, and at this time especially those within the Anglican Church.

The 'Appeal to All Christian People', issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and transmitted to us by the Archbishop of Canterbury, has stirred deeply our minds and hearts. We received it with the respect and sympathy due

to a message from brethren in Christ representing a great historic communion and moved by a spirit of brotherly love towards their fellow Christians; and we have sought to give it the prayerful consideration which it manifestly deserves.

Our reply has been postponed in order that the Federal Council of the Free Churches of England might report upon conversations held with representative Anglican Bishops for the purpose of elucidating the Appeal and the Resolutions that, in the Report of the Lambeth Conference, accompanied it. These conversations having been suspended, and certain documents having been issued by the Joint Conference of Bishops and members of the Federal Council, we are now able to present our reply.

We recognize fully and gladly the courtesy and lofty purpose of those who made the Appeal. These qualities are manifest not only in the document itself but also in the attitude of their representatives throughout the discussion of the high matters which they brought before us. We associate ourselves with our Anglican brethren in longing and prayer for a larger unity among all who follow and serve our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. While we cannot recall without thankfulness and pride the loyalty to truth which constrained our spiritual ancestors to form the Churches of our faith and order, we sorrow sincerely for whatever has been unworthy in the relations of Christian communities to one another; and we express our repentance for any bitter or unjust word or deed through which we may have obscured the testimony of the Gospel or hindered the advance of the Kingdom of God.

We believe in the Catholic Church as the holy society of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, which He founded, of which He is the only Head, and in which He dwells by His Spirit, so that though made up of many communions, organized in various modes, and scattered throughout the world, it is yet one in Him.

We believe that this holy society is truly to be found wherever companies of believers unite as Churches on the ground of a confession of personal faith. Every local community thus constituted is regarded by us as both enabled and responsible for self-government through His indwelling Spirit who supplies wisdom, love, and power, and who, as we believe, leads these communities to associate freely in wider organizations for fellowship and the propagation of the Gospel.

We reverence and obey the Lord Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour, as the sole and absolute authority in all matters pertaining to faith and practice, as revealed in the Scriptures, and we hold that each Church has liberty to interpret and administer His laws. We do not judge the conscience of those who take another view, but we believe that this principle of the freedom of the individual Church under Christ has the sanction of Scripture and the justification of history, and therefore we cannot abandon it without being false to our trust. Moreover, it is plain to us that the headship and sole authority of our Lord in His Church excludes any such relations with the State as may impair its liberty.

This view of the Church determines our attitude towards the special issues raised by the Lambeth Appeal.

The Scriptures, in and through which the Spirit of God speaks, possess for us supreme and unique authority. While we recognize the historic value of ancient creeds, we cannot give them a place of authority comparable with that of the Scriptures.

Christian Baptism and the Communion of the Lord's Supper are duly received by us not only as rites instituted and hallowed by our Lord Himself but as means of grace to all who receive them in faith.

Because we hold the Church to be a community of Christian believers, the ordinance of baptism is administered among us to those only who make a personal confession of

repentance and faith. We baptise by immersion in water in accordance with the mode of baptism received by our Lord and practised by His earliest followers as recorded in the New Testament, and because this symbolic representation guards the thought of that inner baptism of the Holy Spirit which is central in Christian experience. In our judgement the baptism of infants incapable of offering a personal confession of faith subverts the conception of the Church as the fellowship of believers. We recognize that those concerning whom Jesus said 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven' belong to God, and believe that no rite is needed to bring them into relation with Him. But many of our Churches hold services at which infants are presented, the duties, privileges, and responsibilities of parents emphasized, and the prayers of the Church offered for children and parents.

The Lord's Supper is observed regularly and devoutly by our Churches. Its value for us depends upon both the presence of our Lord and the faith with which we receive the bread and wine that show forth His redemptive sacrifice; but not upon the official position of a celebrant or upon any change in the elements due to words of consecration. It seems to us contrary to the simplicity that is in Christ that the full effect of the Lord's Supper as a means of grace should be held to depend on episcopal ordination.

In general, the place given to Sacraments by the Lambeth Appeal would, it appears, exclude from the universal Church of our Lord bodies of devoted Christians with whom we enjoy fellowship, and to this exclusion we cannot assent.

Our doctrine of the Church determines our conception of the ministry. We hold firmly the priesthood of all believers, and therefore have no separated order of priests. The ministry is for us a gift of the Spirit to the Church, and is an office involving both the inward call of God and the commission of the Church. We can discover no ground for believing that such commission can be given only through an episcopate,

and we hold that the individual Church is competent to confer it. For us there is no more exalted office than a ministry charged with preaching the Word of God and with the care of souls. Those called to devote their whole lives to such tasks are held in special honour. Yet any full description of the ministerial functions exercised among us must also take account of other believers who, at the call of the Church, may preside at the observance of the Lord's Supper or fulfil any other duties which the Church assigns to them.

Our ministry is one of those which our brethren of the Anglican Church cordially recognize in their Appeal as having been 'manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace'. Since God has used it in building up Baptist Churches throughout the world which now comprise more than eleven million communicants, we cannot in any way deny its validity and sufficiency.

The deepening sense of friendship and unity between the various parts of the one Church of Christ gladdens us. We thank God that many ancient misunderstandings are passing away, that in our own country hostility and bitterness are giving place to charity and co-operation, and that the Lambeth Appeal by its language and spirit has drawn the Churches nearer to one another.

It will be gathered from this reply that union of such a kind as the Bishops have contemplated is not possible for us. We would say this not only with that frankness which we believe is the highest courtesy among Christian brethren, but with the assurance of our regret that the way in which they would have us go with them is not open.

Further progress in the direction of Christian unity can be secured, we are convinced, only by unreserved mutual recognition. We gladly acknowledge the reality of the ministry of our Anglican brethren, whose representative Bishops have similarly acknowledged the reality of our

ministry. This mutual recognition is significant and full of hope.

We believe that the time has come when the Churches of Christ should unite their forces to meet the need of the world. We therefore are prepared to join the Church of England in exploring the possibility of a federation of equal and autonomous Churches in which the several parts of the Church of Christ would co-operate in bringing before men the will and the claims of our Lord.

We assure our brethren of our earnest prayer that the blessing of God may rest upon the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and that He may continue to impart abundantly to its members the riches of His grace.

Finally, we would reaffirm our belief in the real spiritual unity of all who are loyal to Christ and His truth, and our eagerness to welcome every means by which, in common action for the spread of His message and the helping and healing of men, that unity may be displayed to the world.

Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

128. The Presbyterian Church of England

Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, May 5, 1926

The Assembly called for the Report of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, which was submitted by the Rev. Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson, Convener. On his motion, seconded by the Rev. W. Lewis Robertson, the Report was received and the following Resolutions were adopted:

1. The Assembly records its appreciation of the function discharged by the Federal Council, and, in particular, of the way in which it has represented the Free Churches in the Joint Conferences which have been held on the Lambeth Appeal.

2. The Assembly, understanding that these Joint Conferences have come to a close for the present, records its thankfulness for the brotherly spirit in which they have been carried on, and believes that, even though no result in the form of union has been reached, the opportunity which has thus been given for Anglicans and Free Churchmen to meet together and understand one another's position has been of real value and will bear fruit in future days.

3. The Assembly, recognizing that its representatives on the Federal Council were only authorized to confer with the representatives of the Anglican Church, and were not instructed to present any formal reply to the Lambeth Appeal in the name of the Church, instructs its representatives on the Council to meet as a Committee and draw up a suitable letter recalling the cordiality with which, five years ago, the Church received the Lambeth Appeal, expressing the interest with which it has followed the reports of the Conferences which have been held, associating it generally with the conclusions set forth by the Federal Council in its Resolutions on the Report of the Conferences at Lambeth, and assuring the Anglican Church of its continued desire to do all that shall draw the people of Christ closer together in the unity which He designs for His Church. The Assembly further directs that this letter be presented for approval to the Executive Commission meeting in October, and, on being so approved, be signed by the Moderator and Clerk and forwarded to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

129. The Primitive Methodist Church

Reply adopted by the Annual Conference, June 1926

Your Grace,—The Annual Conference of the Primitive Methodist Church has received from the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Church of England its Resolutions

passed in September 1925 on the Report of the Proceedings of the Joint Conferences held during the years 1921–5 at Lambeth Palace. The duty of responding to the 'Appeal to All Christian People' rests with the individual denominations from which the Federal Council derives its authority. We have refrained from doing so while the Conferences between representatives of the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches were in progress. These Conferences were not concerned with negotiations for reunion—for the initiation of which the time is, indeed, not ripe—but were directed to the removal of misapprehensions and the promotion of a fuller and clearer insight into each other's point of view. Now that they have been suspended, having attained this object, and the Report is before us, we take the earliest opportunity of sending our reply.

Since the problems involved have been so thoroughly explored by the Joint Sub-Committee under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, we think that no useful purpose can be served at present by any attempt on our part to travel in detail over the ground covered by the Lambeth Appeal. We content ourselves with expressing our general assent to the Resolutions of the Federal Council.

We recognize the solemn responsibility which lies upon all the Churches to unite in presenting to our distracted age the claims of our Lord and Redeemer to reign in every sphere of human life and His sufficiency for all its needs. We are distressed that our witness is weakened by our lamentable divisions, which are a stumbling-block to many whom otherwise we might win for His Kingdom. We realize that the healing of these deep-seated divisions is no easy task, and sadly confess that at present we cannot clearly see our way. Yet we gratefully acknowledge that the 'Appeal to All Christian People' has created a new situation, and our hopes are also encouraged by the many tokens that the Spirit of God is manifestly guiding His people to a deeper unity of

spirit and a fuller fellowship in action. Meanwhile we will continue to pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

We desire to thank your Grace and those associated with you, especially his Grace the Archbishop of York, for the pains you have taken to make your position clear, for the readiness you have shown to appreciate our point of view, and for the conciliatory temper which has eased the tension of debate even when the most controversial problems were under discussion. These qualities match the nobility of the Lambeth Appeal itself, which lifted the whole question of Reunion to a loftier level and into a new and sweeter atmosphere.

We have the honour to remain,

Your Grace's humble servants,

A. Lewis Humphries, President,
M. Bourne, Vice-President,
A. Musson Kelly, Secretary.

16 *June* 1926.

130. The United Methodist Church

Resolution of the Annual Conference, July 1926

That this Conference notes carefully and with much interest that the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, in reviewing the findings of the Joint Conferences held between twenty-five of its representatives and the two Archbishops and other Bishops of the Church of England, recalls and emphasizes four main positions regarding faith and order which have been explored by the Joint Committees:

(I) That the large measure of agreement between the Churches concerned on vital and fundamental matters of *faith* is to be recognized, valued, and emphasized, and is such that on the strength of this alone the Free Churches declare

their readiness to join with their Anglican brethren not only in moral and social, but in religious and evangelical work wherever possible.

(II) That on the issue of *polity* the Joint Committee was agreed that an episcopacy, not in its present form but of a 'constitutional' character, should be an essential element in the order of the United Church, place being 'similarly' given to elements of presbyteral and congregational order as equally essential elements; and that this proposal is not to be taken in one part of it only, but in its entirety.

(III) That on the matter of *recognition* special note should be taken of the following statement made by the Anglican representatives in their first memorandum on the 'Status of the Free Church Ministry':

'It seems to us to be in accord with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Churches concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.'

(IV) That on the question of *authorization* the Anglican representatives seem still inclined, despite the declaration above quoted, to insist that Free Church ministers accept ordination—at least in the form known as *sub conditione* expressed in some such words as 'If thou art not already ordained'—at episcopal hands, though the Anglican memorandum does not exclude the alternative method of a 'commission' which shall be (*a*) mutual and (*b*) unambiguously not an ordination.

In receiving the above summary this Conference

1. Endorses the thanks of the Federal Council to the Anglican representatives on the Joint Committee for the care, conciliation, and candour with which they considered

and replied to the questions submitted on behalf of the Free Churches.

2. Rejoices in the assurance of the Federal Council that the Conferences which have taken place have done much to bring representative members of the Churches concerned into closer fellowship and to a better understanding of each other's position, and have also prepared the way to further progress towards unity in the future.

3. Agrees that in the United Church polity place must be found 'similarly' for episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational elements as equally essential elements, it being understood that this proposal is not to be taken in one part of it only, but in its entirety, and that the Conference is not committed to the suggestions of how these elements can be reconciled which are made in the memorandum on the question submitted to the Joint Conference.

But the Conference records its strong conviction that neither our Churches nor our ministers will be prepared to accept a form of Church Union which involves any form of reordination which implies, or seems to imply, that our ministers do not exercise real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church, and the Conference joins the Federal Council in saying that it would 'deeply regret if the fortunes of the Lambeth Appeal, so far as non-episcopal Christendom is concerned, were finally bound up with a proposal so unconvincing and so unpromising as that of requiring the reordination to the ministry of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Church of men explicitly acknowledged to be in that very ministry'.

The Conference fervently prays that grace may be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and that in answer to our Lord's prayer they all may be one, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him.

131. The Congregational Union

REPLY ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY IN THE MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY, MAY 11, 1927

We, the Delegates of the Congregational Churches of England and Wales in session assembled, send greetings to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Church, and desire to place on record our sincere appreciation of the Christian spirit which prompted their Appeal for Unity and our lively gratitude for the same. We have delayed making any formal reply so long as the official conferences arising out of the Appeal were being continued. Now that they are over for the time being, we feel it incumbent upon us to make some comments on the situation as we understand it.

1. We reciprocate with all earnestness the longing of our Anglican friends for a closer Christian unity. We, too, believe that God wills fellowship among Christian people, although we have more hope of a union based on the cultivation of friendship among differing Christian communions than of a union based on any attempt to embrace them all within one uniform system or organization. We cannot regard the existence of separate Churches, or the variety in the expression of Christian faith and life for which they stand, as necessarily contrary to the mind of Christ: what is entirely contrary is the spirit of sectarian jealousy and dissension which has too often animated Churches in the past and must assuredly be abandoned on every hand before union can become possible.

2. We recognize that there can be no real union of fruitful fellowship apart from some agreement on the fundamentals of our Christian faith; but we must once more record our conviction that this cannot be secured by the imposition of creeds or formularies. We believe that there is a better way —the way of freedom under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

And while accepting the Scriptures as the general rule and standard of faith, and being willing that the united Church should make declaration of its faith from time to time for the help of its members and the information of those without, we would not make such declaration binding upon any, believing as we do that God has always more light and truth to break forth from His Word.

3. We recognize that the ministry of any united Church must be a ministry duly authorized by the whole Church through its representatives. We agree that this authorization should take the form of ordination—as the recognition and ratification of the call of God to the ministry, and as the commissioning of the man so called, after due preparation, to work in a particular sphere. We cannot, however, agree that episcopal ordination should be essential to the exercise of the ministry in any united Church of which we as Congregationalists are to form part. The theory that only through the laying on of a bishop's hands can a ministry be made valid runs counter to our deepest convictions. If the office of bishop is to be retained in any united Church, we agree that it should be made purely elective and representative. We wish, moreover, that it were possible to avoid the use of this historic term, which, just because it is historic, cannot fail to suggest and perpetuate ideas as to authority and the transmission of grace from which we entirely dissociate ourselves.

4. We regret the ambiguity which has crept into the discussions on the status of existing Free Church ministries, owing to the proposal that Free Church ministers should 'receive their commission to minister to the whole fellowship through episcopal ordination'. To us, this proposal does not seem to harmonize with the expressed belief of the Lambeth Conference that our ministries 'possess spiritual reality', and have been 'manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace'; nor with the subsequent

admission that they are 'real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church'.

We should be prepared to welcome some solemn act of mutual recognition; but the proposal of ordination *sub conditione* cannot be accepted by us.

5. We Congregationalists are by conviction Protestant Free Churchmen. We regard the Church of Jesus Christ as a spiritual body, under His sole Headship; and we feel the State establishment and control of any Church to be a usurpation. We are sincerely anxious to know whether such a united Church as the Appeal suggests would be a free Church, in the sense of enjoying complete spiritual autonomy; and whether it would continue to be loyal to the broad principles of the Reformation. Before any further steps could be taken, we should require more definite assurance on both these points.

6. We thank God for the spirit which was manifested in your Appeal. Like you, we desire, and we are ourselves prepared for, the fullest possible co-operation in the work of the Kingdom of God between all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ. We, too, long for a deeper understanding, a closer sympathy, and a wider fellowship, especially in the solemn acts of worship, between all branches of the now divided Church. We therefore plead for closer co-operation along the lines of the Lambeth Appeal and in the spirit which it breathes; for we are very confident that only by such means will be created that temper and atmosphere which can make re-union real and fruitful. In all the Churches people need to learn to work and worship together, and to find in their realization of common values, the way to unity and peace. We unite with you in humble, earnest prayer, that we may all more clearly discern what is the mind of Christ, entirely desiring in this, as in every other matter, to be guided by the Holy Spirit of God.

V. THE MORAVIAN CHURCH

[Communications have taken place between the Church of England and the Moravian Church (*Unitas Fratrum*) over a considerable period, and the question of reciprocity in ministrations was brought before the Lambeth Conference of 1878. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 passed some important Resolutions as a result of the report of a special committee on the orders of the *Unitas*. Negotiations began, but were suspended in 1914. Following the Lambeth Conference of 1920 certain Anglican representatives under the chairmanship of Dr. E. C. S. Gibson, Bishop of Gloucester, conferred and corresponded with Moravian representatives under the chairmanship of Bishop H. R. Mumford. The series of communications closed in 1924 in the circumstances described in the final documents. For convenience Resolutions 70–3 of the Lambeth Conference 1908 are given below:

The Lambeth Conference 1908

70. For the sake of unity, and as a particular expression of brotherly affection, we recommend that any official request of the *Unitas Fratrum* for the participation of Anglican Bishops in the consecration of Bishops of the *Unitas* should be accepted, provided that

(i) Such Anglican Bishops should be not less than three in number and should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Consecration and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishops belong.

(ii) The Synods of the *Unitas* (*a*) are able to give sufficient assurance of doctrinal agreement with ourselves in all essentials (as we believe that they will be willing and able to do) and (*b*) are willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Communion; and (*c*) are willing to accord a due recognition to the position of our Bishops within Anglican Dioceses and jurisdictions; and (*d*) are willing to adopt a rule as to the administration of Confirmation more akin to our own.

71. After the conditions prescribed in the preceding Resolution have been complied with, and a Bishop has been consecrated in accordance with them, corresponding invitations from any Bishop of the *Unitas Fratrum* to an Anglican Bishop and his Presbyters to participate in the ordination of a Moravian Presbyter should be accepted, provided that the Anglican Bishop should participate both in the saying of the Prayers of Ordination and in the laying on of hands, and that the rite itself is judged to be sufficient by the Bishops of the Church of our Communion to which the invited Bishop belongs.

72. Any Bishop or Presbyter so consecrated or ordained should be free to minister in the Anglican Communion with due episcopal licence; and, in the event of the above proposals—i.e. Resolutions 1 and 2—being accepted and acted upon by the Synods of the *Unitas* during the period of transition some permission to preach in our churches might on special occasions be extended to Moravian Ministers by Bishops of our Communion.

73. We recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to name a committee to communicate, as need arises, with representatives of the *Unitas* and also to direct that the decisions of the present Conference be communicated to the *Secretarius Unitatis*.]

132. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee on certain points raised by the Lambeth Resolutions 1920

FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE ARCHBISHOP'S COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 31, 1920

The Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference having reference to the proposed intercommunion with the Moravian Church in the British Province,[1] have been considered by the Moravian Committee, consisting of the Bishops and the Board of Provincial Elders of the said Province.

Our Committee begs to submit for the consideration of the Anglican Committee the following expression of opinion on what we look upon as very important matters.

It will be more convenient to take each point separately.

I. *Resolution 70, ii b—Lambeth Conference 1908.* 'Willing to explain its position as that of a religious community or missionary body in close alliance with the Anglican Church.'

In correspondence the position has been illustrated by reference to the Franciscans in the Middle Ages. (See Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Hasse, April 7, 1909.) There may be certain features in the origin and tendency of our earliest work in this country which suggest the parallel. Since that time,

[1] See Document No. 2 *supra*, Resolutions 29, 30.

however, we have become settled in this country as a branch of an International Church, with its organized congregations and system of Church Government. Throughout the world we are known, not as a religious 'order', but as a *Church*, in the same sense as the term is used in reference to other Churches. We would therefore submit the following points:

(*a*) We dare not ignore or hide that while we in a certain sense might speak of ourselves as a 'missionary body', in the consciousness of our people we are much more, namely, a Church of ancient lineage, and not merely an order within a Church. It would be quite unreal to describe ourselves as an order; were we thus to describe ourselves the question might indeed be asked, what Church is it in the midst of which we minister?

(*b*) We claim, and ever have enjoyed, the freedom to assert ourselves as a Church, when permitted by the law of the land, and when led to do so, and it is in this way that we have become an International Community or International Church.

(*c*) To describe ourselves officially and deliberately as the Resolution suggests, would be by our own act to reduce permanently our ecclesiastical position, and to become less in this country than in any other country to which, in the providence of God, we have been sent.

(*d*) To enter into an alliance with the Anglican Communion on such terms would mean an acknowledgement by us that we are incorporated in the Anglican Communion, derive our status in this country from the Anglican Authorities, and are ultimately under their rule, however lenient and benevolent that rule might be. In support of our position we would refer you to Resolution of our General Synod 1909. '(3) We regard our position as that of an independent branch of the Church Catholic.'

We feel we could not recommend to Synod such an agreement with any prospect of obtaining its confirmation. To us there exists only one basis, namely, the full mutual recognition of two independent Churches, working together on lines agreeable to both. We do not think a way to that end will be found through the loss or reduction of our present status among the Churches.

II. *Resolution 70, ii c—Lambeth Conference 1908.*

Here also it seems to us that the 'due recognition' required from us may be interpreted as exceeding what we, and the Synod as the custodian of the liberty and rights of our Church, could be expected, or are entitled to accord.

Whilst we should be quite prepared for the fullest exchange of views and friendly consultation with the Anglican authorities as circumstances indicate, we feel that ministers of the Moravian Church, when acting within the sphere of their own Church, cannot be under jurisdiction of Anglican bishops. When ministering in any place which is under Anglican authority they would, as a matter of course, be under the jurisdiction of the Anglican bishop —just as any Anglican clergyman would be under the jurisdiction of our Provincial Board when ministering in a place belonging to our Church.

If *Clause ii c* should be interpreted to mean that Moravian ministers would be under the jurisdiction of the Anglican bishops, otherwise than as above provided for, in our opinion this would expose us to grave dangers. It is possible to conceive of Anglican clergymen, or even bishops, who are not sympathetic towards our work, and whose action might jeopardize it in their districts. We therefore feel the need of very definite authoritative explanations and guarantees as to the meaning of this clause.

Any mistake on this point of jurisdiction would at once put us in a position inferior to other Free Churches, and,

moreover, we do not think that the cause of a much wider union, which we all have at heart, would be well served if the first example of what such a Union implies were to demonstrate that the supremacy of the Anglican authorities is essential, involving, as it seems to do, the loss of free movement and development on the part of the Churches which join the Union. We are persuaded that on such terms the Free Churches would find it very difficult, or impossible, to come into union with the Anglican Church.

III. *Resolution 70 i—Lambeth Conference 1908.*

It was agreed by both Committees in the year 1912, that joint consecrations by bishops of both Churches should be a first outward and visible sign of our intercommunion, and to this we again express our assent.

IV. *Resolution 70, ii d—Lambeth Conference 1908.*

In the Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference 1920, the following occurs: 'It might be possible, we think, for the fact of confirmation by a Presbyter to be regarded as no bar to the measure of intercommunion proposed, provided that it is distinctly laid down that authority for such action on the part of Presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop, there being precedents for this in East and West.'

We find no Resolution of the Lambeth Conference confirming this, but should your Committee and the Central Consultative Body confirm it, we are prepared to recommend to our Provincial Synod that authority to confirm be given to Presbyters at their ordination.

V. *Deacons presiding at the celebration of Holy Communion.*

Although we do not deny the principle on which we have hitherto acted, of conferring upon deacons the right

to administer the sacraments, for the sake of unity we are prepared to recommend to Synod that the celebration of the Holy Communion in the congregations be restricted to bishops and presbyters.

Before closing this expression of our opinion it seems but fair in candour to add, that following the traditional belief of our Church, we do not give the first place to, nor regard as absolutely essential to mutual recognition between the Churches, any change in our ecclesiastical practice, for in our opinion mutual recognition arises out of considerations of a very different order.

In thus expressing our views, it is, however, and always has been, far from our purpose to convey the impression of any desire on our part to restrict our relations to intercommunion in the more limited sense, i. e. freedom to administer the Holy Communion by accredited ministers in each other's Churches, to exchange in other ministerial services, and to the right of members of each Church to participate in the other's celebration of the Holy Communion and in ordinary worship.

We are fully sensible as to the desirability of also extending the scope of our intercommunion to other channels of church life, and of making it the means of mutual helpfulness in any way which may be possible and advisable; indeed we gladly hope and look for such a result.

But bearing in mind our antecedents, and especially our independence, we feel this desirable end must be attained by other means than what would amount to incorporation into the Anglican system. Our opinion is that by consultation and good feeling between the respective Authorities, possibilities and means of co-operation will be evolved, not on previously fixed lines, but in a natural way, in conformity with the requirements of our mutual interests, and as circumstances permit, and we believe that hindrances to

such co-operation having been removed, the inherent advantages of it will become more and more valued as such development, furthering the interests of both Churches, proceeds.

HERBERT R. MUMFORD,
Chairman.

133. Reply of the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Moravian Committee on certain points raised by the Lambeth Resolutions 1920

MAY 1921

Resolution 70 (ii) of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 offered a description of the position which in the opinion of the Conference the *Unitas Fratrum* might be held to occupy when reunited with the Church of England. We are not altogether surprised that the Moravian Church is unprepared to adopt that description as its own. But we think that the language of the Resolution may be interpreted in a way that will not hurt the just and proper self-respect of the venerable Unitas.

English theologians have not been accustomed to speak of a plurality of Churches except in the only sense which has the sanction of the New Testament, viz. of the local branches of a single and undivided society. It is only in this sense that the Church of England itself claims to be a Church. It was presumably unwillingness to recognize two or more Churches in any other than the local sense that led the Conference of 1908 to use a form of words which might seem to do less than justice to the history and significance of the Moravian Church. In the light of what was done by the Conference of 1920 we venture to say that the ideal 'alliance' which

we contemplate is not an alliance between two separate Churches, but such an union as would make the Moravian Church of the British Provinces, after those alterations which its authorities are now ready to recommend, an integral part of a single reunited Church. The relation which we set before ourselves is not that of absorption, by which those now separated from us would become exactly such as we are, nor yet that of federation between bodies independent and exclusive of each other. It is of visible union and full brotherly communion between ourselves and associations of Christians who may differ from us in their practical system, and even to some extent in their theoretical outlook, but who are willing to be embraced with us in one comprehensive Church. The Church of England has no desire to lower the status of the Moravian Church, or to take away its autonomy. We believe that it would be a loss to Christendom if union were to be effected on terms which would hinder the free development of the Unitas on its own God-given lines. But we think that this development could go forward even more favourably within the larger unity, consisting (it must be remembered) not of the existing Church of England alone, but of the existing Church of England with the addition of the Moravian Church itself, to be joined eventually, as we hope, by others now in separation, as honoured and self-governing factors in the composition of the whole. Such is the meaning which we would attach to the phrase of 1908, 'a religious community' 'in close alliance with the Anglican Communion'.

With regard to point (*c*) within Resolution 70 (ii), we would recall to our Moravian brethren that our theory is that the Diocesan Bishops occupy a twofold position. On the one hand they are—as it is hoped that the Moravian Bishops will consider themselves to be—joint leaders of the Christian community at large, and on the other hand they are held responsible in some sense for all the souls within a

given area. Even now the spiritual welfare of many who do not acknowledge their authority is a matter of concern to them. It is hoped that after reunion the interest which they take in the Moravian Churches within their Dioceses may be welcomed and encouraged. But the desire for 'due recognition' does not mean that the Diocesan Bishops would seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Moravian communities. Those communities would remain responsible to the Moravian Bishops alone. Their manner of Divine Service, their discipline, their finance, their missionary activities, would be independent of the Diocesan. The kind of 'recognition' intended is, for example, that the Diocesan should be consulted if the Brethren think of opening a church in a new place, and that Moravian presbyters should be assured of the consent of the Diocesan before they officiate in Anglican churches. It may be well to add, though assurances on this point have been repeatedly given, that after reunion the Moravian portion of the Church in this country would not enter into new relations with any other Christian bodies without conferring with their Anglican brethren. Their Anglican brethren on the other hand would not wish to weaken the connexion of the British Moravians with Herrnhut and the foreign Provinces of the Unitas.

The Moravian authorities have shown a most gratifying readiness to meet our wishes with regard to Confirmation. We are not sure, however, whether the proposal that 'authority to confirm be given to presbyters at their ordination' altogether satisfies the recommendation of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference that 'authority for such action on the part of presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop' (*Report*, p. 158). It would rather seem to make Confirmation a normal part of the functions of the presbyter; whereas the Church of England, following the only examples known to Holy Scripture, regards it as proper to the highest order of the ministry. We think that 'direct

delegation' would rather imply a special commission on each occasion, or at least one renewable from time to time, and conferred only on particular presbyters.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

EDGAR C. S. GLOUCESTER,

May 2, 1921. Chairman.

134. A Memorandum from the Moravian Committee on Anglican Relations to the Archbishop's Committee

JUNE, 1922

1. We thank the Anglican Committee for its reply to our last communication. In it we find an interpretation of the phrase 'religious community . . . in close alliance with the Anglican Communion' (see Lambeth Conference Resolution, 1908, 70. ii *b*). This interpretation, and indeed the whole tone of the communication, further illustrates the admirable spirit in which the Anglican Committee has approached the subject, and has considered our criticisms and suggestions from time to time. We thank you for this consideration, and for the more detailed description of what you conceive would be the relations between them in case of 'alliance' between the British Province of the Moravian Church and the Anglican Church being realized. A film of indefiniteness, however, seems to be thrown over your interpretation by the words by which it is introduced: 'we think that the language of the Resolution may be interpreted in a way', &c. It seems to us a necessity that some more exact description or statement should be given than one which may bear interpretations of widely differing import.

2. We thank you, also, for the repeated assurance that 'The Church of England has no desire to lower the status of the Moravian Church, or to take away its autonomy', and

for making it clear that the Moravian Church would have preserved and secured to it complete control in matters of its 'Divine service, discipline' (which we understand to cover all Church regulations), 'finance and missionary activities'.

3. (Resolution 70, ii *c*). It is quite clear to us that two Church Communions in close 'alliance' would naturally consult each other before taking steps leading to alliance with other Religious Bodies. What we desire from you, is a more emphatic assurance that any existing relations which we possess and enjoy with Christian Communities, with which we are already in inter-communion, would not be disturbed, and that the expression of that inter-communion should continue on our part to be quite free. In connexion with this may we draw your attention to Resolution 3 of our General Synod 1909: 'That we hold that Inter-communion with the Anglican Church must rest on the same mutual recognition and freedom to co-operate, as now exists between us and several Churches, Episcopal and other.' Also to Resolution 5, which speaks of 'recognizing the position of communicant members who have not been confirmed by a Bishop, or of communicant members of other Churches which do not observe this rite' (viz. Confirmation). These Resolutions, of course, do not cover all the ground of the relations referred to.

In reading the third paragraph of your last communication we find the difficult word to be 'authority', as attached to the diocesan Bishop. We assume the main feature of this authority to consist in our obligation to consult the Diocesan when we wish to open new work. We think it quite reasonable to ascertain his opinion and should not lightly set aside any objections on his part. But we could not readily submit to the view that his consent is an indispensable condition. The assured consent of the Diocesan before a Moravian Presbyter officiates in an Anglican Church is quite in accord-

ance with what we stated in our last Memorandum in paragraph 2 under 'Resolution 70. ii *c*'.

Confirmation by Presbyters.

We regret that your reply does not meet us in the matter of presbyters administering the rite of Confirmation. The practice of our Church is admittedly not an innovation, for the practice was followed to some extent in the West, and has been and is still followed in the East. With Resolution 5 of our General Synod 1909 before us, also the Resolution of our Provincial Synod 1921, it would be difficult for us to go further in concession than what is contained in our last Memorandum. We have to bear in mind not only these Synodal Resolutions, but also the fact that in none of the Provinces of the Moravian Church is the practice followed of confirming only by Bishops, and that our common practice, as in the Eastern Church, of the ordained Minister of a Congregation confirming his own candidates, is highly valued by both ministers and people. We think you will appreciate the difficulty of establishing a practice in one Province of the Church, which is contrary to the practice for the same purpose throughout the rest of the Church. From our side we have to consider whether 'alliance' with the Anglican Communion would tend to alienate us from other parts of our Church, and to aim to avoid such an issue.

It would be of assistance to us if you could tell us whether there are any other points which it seems to you would have to be discussed and settled before an 'alliance' can be effected. We feel that this question of 'alliance' with the Anglican Church is of such vital importance to the whole membership of our Church in this Province that all the bearings of the matter must be laid before our congregations, so that the voice of the congregations may be expressed in Synod when the time comes for the question to

be decided. We think you will agree with us that 'alliance' would be worse than of no value unless we could carry the rank and file of our Church membership with us.

HERBERT R. MUMFORD,
Chairman.

135. Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to the Moravian Committee

DECEMBER 1922

DEAR BISHOP MUMFORD,

We thought it best, by way of answer to your Memorandum of last June, to ask you to meet us and talk face to face over the questions raised. Your Committee was kind enough to do what we asked, on October 11, and we had a helpful discussion. You thought, however, at the end of our meeting that it would be more satisfactory to the brethren to have a written reply from us. We therefore endeavour to give such a reply.

1. We are grateful to you for the kind way in which you speak of the spirit in which our last written communication was drawn up. We are indeed convinced that perfect frankness, together with sympathy for the views of others, is the only way in which the unity of the Church can be restored. We confess that we were surprised at your feeling that 'a film of indefiniteness' was thrown over the interpretation which we gave of a certain phrase, by our saying that we thought that the language of the Resolution might be 'interpreted' in the way we suggested. We are not plenipotentiaries; therefore we did not presume to offer a dogmatic definition of words which were not our own. But we cannot think for a moment that the Bishops of the Church of England will repudiate us. We have been appointed authoritatively to conduct these negotiations with the

Unitas Fratrum, and it is unlikely to the last degree that our actions and interpretations will be thrown over by those who entrusted us with the duty.

2. We need make no further observations upon this point.

3. Upon your third point it may be necessary to enlarge somewhat. Although the expression 'alliance' occurs in the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, we have in our negotiations with you made it clear that the conception of a mere 'alliance' does not satisfy us. We contemplate something more. We believe that what our Lord desires is union. We have explained sufficiently that union is not inconsistent with that autonomy of which the last paragraph spoke. But that union must make us not two Churches but one Church. If you will accept the phrase already famous in your history, *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, it would express our view of the relationship—except perhaps the diminutive: let us rather say *ecclesia*, but *in ecclesia*. Such a relationship cannot but affect to some extent the freedom of the two bodies united. The Bishops of the Unitas, if the union takes place, would have the right to expound their views in the gatherings of the Bishops of England, and would doubtless be heard with the deference which is their due—particularly in all matters which concern what may be called the foreign politics of the Church. In like manner the Bishops of the Unitas would, we are sure, be careful to take no action likely to embarrass their brother Bishops in the whole body to which they belong.

The answer to the question whether any existing relations would be disturbed by such an union depends upon the previous question, what the existing relations are. We have already said that we do not seek to weaken at all the connexion between the Moravians of the British Provinces and Herrnhut. Though the connexion may cause some anomalies in theory, we believe that in practice these would be got over without difficulty, and that the connexion would be fruitful

for good. The Church of Sweden, for example, reckons the Augustana Synod of America to be her daughter Church in full communion with herself, although the American daughter has no Bishops. This did not hinder the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920 from recommending that English Bishops should take part in consecrating Swedish Bishops, which was regarded as a most solemn and official act of communion. It was felt that this did not commit the Church of England constructively to communion with the Augustana Synod. On the same principle we shall not feel committed to anything which we have not approved by your remaining in the connexion which you now have with Herrnhut; and we hope that when your union with us is completed, your influence upon Herrnhut may succeed in making Herrnhut still more a centre of reunion on the Continent than it is at present.

It may be otherwise with regard to some other bodies, particularly in this country. We speak in the freedom of brotherly intercourse, without censuring others. A recent action on the part of a prominent member of the Unitas gives a pointed example of what we mean. The 'Reformed Church of England' is a body which has detached itself quite recently from the English Church with no other *raison d'être*, as far as we know, than the conviction that the English Church is at present disloyal to the principles for which it nominally stands. Now to do anything which helps to establish and perpetuate such a body is, manifestly, to encourage, or at least to condone, the spirit of division or schism. It is to approve of the tendency to disintegration. Obviously no one could at the same time desire union with the Church of England and promote the separate interests of groups who leave it, unless under a misapprehension. The same observation applies in some degree to other groups of earlier separation. We thankfully note that there is less of sectarian feeling among these than there

formerly was, and the Church of England will look to the *Unitas Fratrum* for aid in promoting reunion with them—not on the principle of acquiescing in divisions, but in healing them.

You quote from the Resolutions of 1909 a reference to the mutual recognition which already exists between yourselves 'and several Churches, Episcopal and other'. It will perhaps conduce to clearness if you will be so kind as to furnish us with a list of the Churches referred to. It was something of a surprise to us to learn that the 'Reformed Church of England', for instance, was in full inter-communion with you. In our conference with Bishop Hassé in November 1909 we were assured that no corporate relations with any Church but the Anglican had ever been considered by the Unitas.

We quite understand that large individual liberty in these matters has been permitted. We do not complain of it. No very strict discipline over private individuals is enforced among ourselves. Nonconformist ministers occasionally present themselves as communicants at our altars, and are not repelled. Many members of our communion, on passing into Scotland, attend the Presbyterian services without incurring reproof. But these are not official actions. They are not publicly encouraged. While we should be unwilling to lay down a stricter rule for the *Unitas Fratrum* than exists for Anglicans, we cannot advise our Moravian brethren on being united with us to exercise Sacramental Communion with communities (other than the Foreign Provinces of the Unitas) which are not in recognized communion with the Church of England. The Holy Communion, to our mind, is not the symbol of private goodwill, but of public and corporate unity. More particularly we regard the Bishop as always and necessarily representing his Church, and bound always to be mindful of the tie which binds him to his brother Bishops.

And here we beg leave to remind you of an assurance already given to us both in private conference and by public authority. Bishop Hassé in 1909 told us that the Unitas in England had 'never accepted a minister of other communities, as such, as a Moravian minister'. He said that in the U.S.A. ministers of other communities had been accepted as Deacons, but then had been ordained Presbyters. In 1911, in reply to a question from the Anglican Committee, the Moravian Bishops and Elders officially stated: 'The Ordinances are ministered among us solely by our own ministers, all of them Episcopally ordained. Ministers of other, non-Episcopal, Churches who enter our Service receive in every case Ordination as Presbyters from our Bishops'. If we understood your Committee rightly in October, this assurance is no longer correct, and ministers of other denominations have been permitted to celebrate the Eucharist in your churches. We must point out the gravity of the change.

It is not that we deny or doubt the blessing bestowed upon ministers ecclesiastically imperfect. But we have been led to believe that in the Church of the Brethren we have to do with a people who value history, and who stand, as we do, for continuity and order. This was markedly shown in the first inception of your separate Ministry, when the action of the Brethren was based upon the determination to 'take thought for the things that are good not only before God, but also before all men'. Our desire is that other bodies of Christians besides yourselves may be brought to share in all that we believe we have inherited from the ancient Church. It is for this reason that we cannot enter into communion with them at present, leading them to believe that their present condition is all that it ought to be. For the security of our common Sacraments we shall be compelled to ask that, in the event of our union, the assurances given us in 1909 and 1911 may be adhered to.

MEMORANDUM WITH REGARD TO CONFIRMATION

We have no commission to go beyond or to recede from the terms laid down by the Lambeth Conference in this matter, but we feel bound to demur to some assertions contained in your paper of June 1922. The Church of England desires above all things to be loyal to Holy Scripture; and in Scripture there is no recorded instance of any but an Apostle laying on hands after Baptism. You justly observe that it is the common practice of the Eastern Church for presbyters to administer the equivalent unction; but 'from the beginning it was not so', and even now the fact that the chrism must be consecrated by the Bishop testifies that the practice is an 'innovation', though of long standing. That presbyteral Confirmation was an 'innovation' in the West, and very exceptionally allowed, is shown by the language of a Roman writer (John the Deacon) about the beginning of the sixth century, who says that there are cases where 'force of necessity' compels presbyters to 'make the holy chrism', as in Africa, where all the Catholic Bishops had been driven into exile, but adds that the Bishops had given permission to do it, so that it might be considered their own act. These were the kind of facts which led the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920 to desire that, in the event of presbyteral Confirmation being continued among you, it should be 'distinctly laid down that authority for such action on the part of presbyters was directly delegated to them by the Bishop', in which case 'it might be possible' for such Confirmation 'to be regarded as no bar to the measure of intercommunion proposed'.

We cannot think of any particular points which have not been sufficiently discussed between us. But while we are willing to exercise all reasonable forethought in order to meet questions that may arise between the uniting Churches, we venture to say that many details must remain to be settled

by the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the practical experience of the reunited community. The Brethren will not be slow to recognize that the Church of England is exercising a considerable measure of faith in seeking union with a Church which has no documentary creed, a liturgy very unlike her own, and traditions which are largely unknown to her members. She is seeking that union on the most honorific terms that can be devised. She does so because she believes that it is the will of Christ. Not forgetting that there are others to be drawn into a like unity, she begins with the Brethren, partly because the providence of God, without choice of hers, has pointed in that direction—partly because she discerns among you special signs of the grace of God and of the love which overcomes all difficulties. We recognize that for you too it is a great adventure. We only ask you to trust us, as we trust you. We believe that where there is that mutual trust and goodwill, problems will find their solution as we go forward.

I am, Yours faithfully,

EDGAR C. S. GLOUCESTER

Signed on behalf of the Committee.

December 12, 1922.

136. Reply of Moravian Committee on Anglican Relations to the Archbishop's Committee's Letter dated December 12, 1922

We thank you for your letter, and quite agree with you that perfect candour is the safest and most satisfactory road by which a right conclusion of our negotiations may be reached.

(1) We regard the central part of your letter as the most important. The expression 'the Moravians of the British Province and Herrnhut' (3, par. 2) is probably not intended

by you to be understood in the sense that other provinces of the Moravian Church (American and Foreign Mission Fields) are excluded, though it might be so interpreted.

(2) The paragraphs which follow refer to our relations with other branches of the Christian Church. Much of what they contain seems to gather round the expression 'corporate unity'. It may be that our view of what 'corporate unity' means is not identical with yours, and from this arises some misunderstanding between us when the term is used. A definition of the term as understood by us therefore appears to be necessary.

By 'corporate union' we understand a unity of constitution organized throughout under one general authority—a unity closer than that of a Federation in which the component parts are not so linked together.

By 'Inter-communion' we understand a Church relationship in which exists an implicitly or explicitly conceded liberty to avail oneself of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments in other Communions. This implies a recognition of the validity of other Ministries on the same foundation of Doctrine, but not an amalgamation or fusion of such Ministries and the Ministry of our own Church.

We regard this as the natural relation between the several households of the faith arising from their common relation to our one Lord, without any express sanction by the constitutional authorities of the churches concerned; but in cases where such express sanction is felt to be desirable we would do everything possible to secure it.

Corporate Union in the above sense we have never had with any Church. Federal Union we have in England and Wales with the other religious bodies of the Free Church Federation, and on the Continent of Europe with other Reformation Churches.

Inter-communion we have had in the past in varying degrees with the Anglican and other State Churches, and

with free religious bodies in many lands, sometimes with, and sometimes without, expressed sanction of the constitutional authorities of our own or of the other Churches.

It is such 'inter-communion' with the Anglican Church that we have desired to quicken and extend, with formal sanction of the Anglican authorities so far as that is felt from their side to be needful.

(3) At the joint meeting of the two Committees last October the question was raised whether an ordained minister of one of the Free Churches could administer the rite of Holy Communion in one of our Congregations. Our reply was that there is nothing in the principles or regulations of our Church to forbid this. The matter is again raised in your last letter (3, par. 6), and was discussed by us at our last meeting. We find no express rule forbidding a non-episcopally ordained minister to 'celebrate' the Communion in our Church, no necessity for such a rule having apparently ever made itself felt, owing to the fact that the practice of our Church in England, from which no exception is known to us, is that only our own ministers act as 'celebrants'. Therefore the assurance of 1911 is in accordance with our present use, and we are sorry if your Committee gathered a contrary impression on October 11, 1922.

(4) There must be some misunderstanding in regard to Bishop Hassé's statement made in 1909, which you quote as follows: 'that the Unitas in England had never accepted a minister of other communities, as such, as a Moravian minister'. Our rule since 1909 is as follows: 'Ministers who have received consecration for Church service in Protestant Churches, which do not recognize the three grades of ordination, and have already served a congregation with the Word and Sacrament, and in the cure of souls, when they become members of the Moravian Church, and are called to a spiritual office, pass as Deacons. But this regulation shall not hinder

the Provincial Boards, in extraordinary cases, from acting as seems best to them'.

In conclusion we repeat what has been stated in our previous communications, that we are most desirous to see the Church of Christ bearing its united witness before the world as one body of believers in Christ and in the truth as revealed in and through Him. But it may be, and indeed is, in many minds a matter of doubt whether the best method for attaining union of the many branches of the Church is by laying down and insisting on principles such as those underlying 3, par. 5 of your letter. In reference to this paragraph a few remarks on our part seem necessary.

To us, too, sacramental communion within one's own spiritual household is the most significant and effective symbol of the close union of its members, and on that account it is uniquely precious and possesses a special import, such as sacramental communion outside one's own borders is not likely to possess or convey.

But when you say that in the event of our union with the Anglican Church the exercise of sacramental communion with communions not recognized by the Church of England cannot be advised, we feel constrained to make our position quite clear, lest there be more expected of us than we can concede.

We have already indicated in par. 2 of this letter that with us inter-communion with other Churches in as far as it exists, is by tacit permission on both sides and not by treaty or official agreement, and by that we wish to abide. It is therefore incumbent upon us to state quite frankly that we in no way can encourage any change in this respect, either in the spirit or in the letter; no restraint can be urged upon our members in this matter, nor can any adverse reflection be cast upon the exercise of such liberty. On the contrary, we wish it to be understood that this liberty may be used with the full cognizance of our church and that there

is no taint of irregularity or undesirability attaching to it. For to us the special value of sacramental communion within our own spiritual household is not incompatible with availing oneself of the privileges of a guest or sharing as far as that is possible the joys and blessings of others not in immediate church connexion with us; and we feel that any disapproval or discouragement in this respect, whether implicit or explicit, public or private, implies an adverse judgement on the value of the ordinances of other communions and conduces to a spirit of aloofness and separation alien to the character of our church and little calculated to further the cause of Christian Union.

Signed by all the members of the Moravian Committee,

P. Asmussen. H. J. Wilson.
J. E. Zippel. Arthur Ward.
J. N. Libbey. H. R. Mumford.

137. Letter from the Archbishop's Committee to the Moravian Committee on Anglican Relations

St. Giles' House, Fareham, Hants.
November 26, 1923.

My dear Bishop Mumford,

Your last letter in reply to ours of December 12, 1922, has brought us not a little sorrow and disappointment, though we thank you for its clear and candid statement of the Moravian position, about which perhaps we had been too sanguine.

You will remember that what was originally in contemplation was an 'alliance' of the Moravians with the Church of England. This 'alliance' was understood to be a thing quite unique, such as had never been formed between the Unitas Fratrum and any other corporate body, and was never likely to be thought of in any other connexion.

Now, if we understand aright, the only thing which the Unitas in England desires, or is prepared for, is to be on the same terms with the Church of England as it already is with many others. If we are mistaken, you will tell us, but such is our impression.

If this be the case, perhaps it will be better that our direct negotiations with you should pause, and that we should await the result of those discussions which happily are going on between representatives of the English Church and various Evangelical Free Churches in the spirit which animated the last Lambeth Conference.

This does not imply any lessening of our affection for the Unitas Fratrum, or of our earnest desire for the 'alliance' of which we have spoken. We acknowledge gratefully the patience, the friendliness, the readiness to remove hindrances, with which we have been met. We trust that these qualities will have their effect on the more general discussions that are now taking place.

Yours very sincerely,

EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, Bishop

Signed on behalf of the Anglican Committee.

138. Final Letter from the Moravian Committee to the Archbishop's Committee on Anglican Relations with the Moravian Church

MORAVIAN CHURCH HOUSE,
32 FETTER LANE, LONDON, E.C. 4.
MARCH 31, 1924.

MY DEAR CANON MASON,

In reply to your letter dated November 26, 1923, we wish in the first place to convey to you our appreciation of the cordial expression of regard in which our Church is held by

our Anglican brethren. We trust you will believe that we cherish similar feelings towards you and the Church you represent. We value your acknowledgement of our endeavours to meet you on various points. If our last communication brought you 'sorrow and disappointment' we can but express our regret.

1. In that communication we endeavoured to state clearly and candidly our position, having in view the Resolutions of the Moravian General Synod of 1909. We regard these as the foundation of the negotiations as carried on from our side. In them it is clearly laid down that, whatever may be the terms agreed upon between us, our existing relations with other Christian Communions must not be sacrificed.

2. The second paragraph of your letter states that 'what was originally in contemplation was an "alliance" of the Moravians with the Church of England'. We believe that the subject of our mutual relations was first introduced with a view to ascertain whether Anglican and Moravian Bishops might assist each other by taking ordinations and confirmations in the West Indies in cases where distance created great inconvenience. But so far as we can ascertain, the actual use of the term 'alliance' only found its way into the negotiations considerably later: viz. after the Lambeth Conference of 1908; and we may point out that the Resolutions of our General Synod passed after the Lambeth Conference just referred to still use the term 'inter-communion'. The implications of an 'Alliance' vary according to the interpretation of its meaning, or, again, as circumstances may point. We hold that Christians of various organizations should always be allies in the truest sense of the term, and that the important thing is that they should find a right expression of this relationship. We are sure that has not been lost sight of by either party in these negotiations. We still prefer the term 'inter-communion'

as pointing to a definite mutual recognition, and expressing that recognition in a practical way. Though we have inter-communion with other Churches, such a relationship with you was intended to be fuller ecclesiastically than we have with other Churches, inasmuch as we do not delegate their ministers to ordain to the ministry of our Church, nor to confirm our candidates for Church membership.

3. We think therefore that you have in some measure mistaken our position when you say 'if we understand aright, the only thing which the Unitas in England desires, or is prepared for, is to be on the same terms with the Church of England as it already is with many others'. We are different from them in administration, in 'orders', and in observing confirmation as the rite through which full church membership is given; and in all these we conform far more closely to the usages of the Church of England. These facts are not regarded lightly by us. Nor do we forget the close fellowship of leaders of the two Churches in the long past.

4. Negotiations for closer fellowship in work between the two bodies having so much in common might well be regarded as full of promise. Indeed the hope has been cherished amongst us, as also among you, that they might produce the first-fruits of that union of the Church of Christ for which so many are praying and working. If a necessary measure of agreement cannot be found between us, it might well be asked how agreement can be reached between the Church of England and other Churches. To us it would seem very regrettable if our attempts to arrive at a mutual understanding and agreement were to cease.

5. Looking back over the whole course of the negotiations, and the communications which have passed between us, we believe they have led to a fuller understanding of those principles we each hold. We had hopes that a measure of

inter-communion might be adopted leading, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, to growth of fuller mutual understanding and sympathy, and to the development of united work. We trust this may yet come to pass.

Signed by the Members of the Moravian Committee,

P. Asmussen. H. J. Wilson.
J. N. Libbey. J. E. Zippel.
A. Ward. H. R. Mumford.

VI. SOUTH INDIA

[As already indicated in Nos. 71–81 of the first series of these *Documents*, the movement for union began in 1919 with a meeting of thirty-three members of the Anglican Communion and the South India United Church at Tranquebar. All but two of the thirty-three were Indian. In 1920 a Joint Committee representing the two Churches was officially appointed, to discuss possibilities of union. From 1920–9 the Joint Committee held eight meetings, the Wesleyan Methodist Church in South India joining in the negotiations from the fifth meeting onwards. The Scheme given here was unanimously accepted by the Joint Committee in March 1929. The authors of the Foreword when publishing the Scheme made it clear that while the governing bodies in India of the three Churches have given their general approval to the basal principles on which union is being sought, and (at least by receiving the *ad interim* reports of the Joint Committee and asking them to continue their discussions and to prepare a complete scheme) to the leading features of the whole scheme, they have not yet officially accepted any part of it, and the scheme as a completed whole is only now presented to them. They further added 'The scheme is frankly an outline. It endeavours to state with sufficient fullness the central points on which agreement between the Churches concerned is necessary for union, but it leaves many details to be worked out after such agreement on the central points has been reached. Yet it is hoped that sufficient detail has been given to show what sort of a Church the united Church in South India would be, and what would be the general nature of its organization and institutional life'.]

139. Proposed Scheme of Union

PREPARED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE CHURCH OF INDIA, BURMA AND CEYLON, THE SOUTH INDIA UNITED CHURCH, AND THE SOUTH INDIA PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH FOR PRESENTATION TO THE GOVERNING BODIES OF THOSE CHURCHES IN INDIA AND ELSEWHERE (1929)

SECTION I

THE UNITING CHURCHES

The Churches or parts of Churches between which union is proposed are the following:

(1) The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon (formerly

known as the Church of England in India) with regard to the dioceses of Madras; Tinnevelly, Madura, and Ramnad; Dornakal; and Travancore and Cochin.

(2) The South India United Church.

Note. This Church is itself the result of a movement which brought into organic union the Churches in South India and Ceylon established by the missions of certain Presbyterian (Reformed) Churches in Great Britain and the United States of America; the London Missionary Society; and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, both of which are supported mainly by Congregational Churches; and (in the Malabar District) by the Basel Evangelical Mission, a union mission supported by Lutheran and Reformed (Presbyterian) Churches in Germany and Switzerland.

(3) The South India Province of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, including the Districts of Madras; Negapatam and Trichinopoly; Hyderabad; and Mysore.

Note. At the date of the preparation of this Scheme by the Joint Committee of the uniting Churches, it was not known whether the diocese of Colombo and the Wesleyan Province of Ceylon would desire to be included in the area of the union.

Section II

THE PURPOSE AND NATURE OF THE UNION

(1) The uniting Churches are agreed that in every effort to bring together divided members of Christ's Body into one organization, the final aim must be the union of all who acknowledge the name of Christ in the Universal Church, and that the test of all local schemes of union is that they should express locally the principle of the great catholic unity of the Body of Christ. Their desire, therefore, is so to organize the Church in South India that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal.

(2) It is the intention and the hope of the uniting Churches that all actions of the united Church will be regulated by the principle that it should maintain fellowship with all those branches of the Church of Christ with which the uniting

Churches now severally enjoy such fellowship, and that it should constantly seek to widen and strengthen this fellowship and to work towards the goal of the full union in one body of all parts of the Church of Christ.

(3) It is also the hope of the uniting Churches that their union will be a means to the greater progress of the Gospel in India, in fulfilment of the Master's own prayer when He said, 'That they may all be one . . . that the world may believe that Thou didst send me'. The result of union should be not merely greater fellowship and peace within the Church and greater eagerness for the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ, but also a greater release of divine power and greater effectiveness for the establishment of His Kingdom on earth.

Section III

THE BASIS OF UNION

The uniting Churches are assured that the unity of His Church for which Christ prayed is a unity in Him and in the Father through the Holy Spirit, and is therefore fundamentally a reality of the spiritual realm. They seek the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But this unity of the Spirit must find expression in the faith and order of the Church, in its worship, in its organization and in its whole life. They therefore state the following as their Basis of Union:

(A) Faith and Order

The uniting Churches hold the faith which the Church has ever held in Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of mankind; and in accordance with the revelation of God which He made, being Himself God incarnate, they worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity.

They accept the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation and as the ultimate standard of faith.

They accept the Apostles' Creed and the Creed commonly called the Nicene, as witnessing to and safeguarding that faith, which is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ, and as containing a sufficient statement thereof for a Basis of Union.

They believe that the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ordained by Christ Himself, are means of grace through which God works in us ; and agree that they should be ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

They believe that the Ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church ; that God Himself calls men into the Ministry through His Holy Spirit, and that their vocation is to lead God's people in worship, prayer and praise, and through pastoral ministrations, the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments (all these made effective by faith) to assist men to receive the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ and to fit them for service ; and they believe that in ordination God, in answer to the prayer of His Church, bestows on and assures to those whom He has called and His Church has accepted for any particular form of the Ministry a commission for it and the grace appropriate to it, which grace, if humbly used, will enable the ministers to perform the same.

Note. It is understood that it will be competent to the united Church to issue supplementary statements concerning the Faith for the guidance of its teachers and the edification of the faithful, provided that such statements be not contrary to the truths of our religion revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

(B) The Episcopate in the united Church

The uniting Churches, recognizing that the Episcopate, the Councils of the Presbyters and the Congregation of the Faithful must all have their appropriate places in the order of life of the united Church, accept in particular the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of their basis of

union, without intending thereby to imply, or to express a judgement on, any theory concerning episcopacy.

The meaning in which the uniting Churches thus accept a historic and constitutional episcopacy is that in the united Church:

(1) the Bishops shall perform their functions in accordance with the customs of the Church, those functions being named and defined in the written constitution of the united Church;

(2) the Bishops shall be elected, both the diocese concerned in each particular case and the authorities of the united Church as a whole having an effective voice in their appointment;

(3) continuity with the historic episcopate shall both initially and thereafter be effectively maintained, it being understood that no particular interpretation of the fact of the historic episcopate is thereby implied or shall be demanded from any minister or member of the united Church; and

(4) every ordination of Presbyters shall be performed by the laying on of hands of the Bishop and Presbyters, and all Consecrations of Bishops shall be performed by Bishops, not less than three taking part in each consecration.

Note. For the proposals with regard to the Consecration of Bishops at the inauguration of the union, see Section XV (p. 183).

(C) The initial Ministry of the united Church

The uniting Churches agree

(1) that the Bishops of the Dioceses of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon which are to be included in the united Church shall be accepted as Bishops of the united Church, provided that they assent to the Basis of Union and accept the Constitution of the united Church;

and that all the other ministers of the uniting Churches in the area of the union shall be acknowledged as ministers of

the Word and of the Sacraments in the united Church, each retaining the standing (whether as a Minister authorized to celebrate the Holy Communion, or as a Deacon or a Probationer) which he had before union in his own Church, provided similarly that such Ministers assent to the Basis of Union and accept the constitution of the united Church; and

(2) that, as is set forth in detail in Section IV of this Scheme, such Bishops and other Ministers shall, subject only to necessary restrictions in certain directions, retain (so far as the united Church is concerned) all rights and liberties which they previously possessed in the several uniting Churches.

(3) These Bishops and other Ministers, together with the Bishops who will be consecrated at the inauguration of the union (see Section XV) shall form the initial ministry of the united Church.

(D) The initial Membership of the united Church

The uniting Churches agree that all persons who at the time of the union are communicant members of any of the uniting Churches in the area of the union shall have the privileges and responsibilities of communicant members of the united Church, and as such shall be at liberty to receive communion in any of its churches.

Similarly all baptized members and catechumens belonging to any of the uniting Churches shall be baptized members and catechumens respectively of the united Church.

(E) The Worship of the united Church

The uniting Churches recognize that they must aim at conserving for the common benefit whatever of good has been gained by each body in its separate history, and that in its public worship the united Church must retain for its

congregations freedom either to use historic forms or not to do so as may best conduce to edification and to the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

It is therefore not their intention that because of the union any form of service at present in use in any of the uniting Churches shall either be forbidden or made compulsory in the united Church.

At the same time, the uniting Churches look towards the gradual preparation of some service book or directory of worship, which would embody everything in existing forms of worship which is found to be helpful for worship in India, together with such forms of worship as Indian Christianity under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may devise in the future.

(F) The Independence of the united Church

The uniting Churches agree that the united Church should of right be free in all spiritual matters from the direction or interposition of any civil government.

They further agree that the united Church must be an autonomous Church and free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or Society external to itself. At the same time they remember that the united Church, on account of its origin and history, must have special relations with the Churches in the West through which it has come into existence, and will regulate its acts by the necessity of maintaining fellowship with other branches of the Catholic Church with which the uniting Churches are now in communion.

They also recognize that the united Church, as a part of the Church Universal, must give full weight to the pronouncements of bodies representative of the whole Church, and, in particular, would desire to take part in the deliberations and decisions of an Oecumenical Council, if such should in the mercy of God be some day called together.

Section IV

THE RELATIONS OF THE UNITED CHURCH WITH OTHER CHURCHES

(A) Of the Church as a Corporate Body

In conformity with the intention and hope of the uniting Churches expressed in Section II of this Scheme:

(1) They are assured that the united Church will seek to be in full communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and equally to be in such relations of communion and fellowship with other Churches as are now maintained with those Churches by the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church in South India.

(2) They hope that invitations to the Lambeth Conference may be extended to the Bishops of the united Church, and that those Bishops will whenever possible accept such invitations; and that similarly affiliation with or membership in the World Presbyterian Alliance, the World Union of Congregational Churches and the Oecumenical Methodist Conference may be granted to the united Church, and that it will whenever possible send delegates to the meetings of those bodies.

(3) They also hope that the united Church may be invited to send friendly or visiting delegates to the assemblies or other representative bodies of the Churches through whose labours the uniting Churches have come into being, and will accept such invitations whenever possible.

(4) They still further hope that the united Church will seek, by interchange of visiting delegates or such other means as may be available, to promote and maintain brotherly relations with other Churches in India and Ceylon.

(B) Of the Ministers and Members of the united Church

(1) The uniting Churches clearly understand that the united Church will have power itself to regulate, to such extent and in such manner as it may from time to time think desirable, the relations of its ministers and members with other Churches, and that action in this respect will be taken either by the Synod of the united Church, or by the diocesan authorities acting in accordance with such general principles or particular rules as may be laid down by the Synod.

(2) While such authority must inhere in the united Church, it is the deliberate intention of the uniting Churches that none of the ministers or members of the united Church shall because of the union forgo any rights with regard to inter-communion and inter-celebration which they possessed before the union.

It is equally the intention of the uniting Churches that the united Church shall in its legislation and executive acts respect the conscientious convictions of its ministers and members.

It will in these matters avoid on the one hand any encouragement of licence or condonation of breaches of Church comity and fellowship, and on the other hand any unchristian rigidity in its regulations or in their application; and in all its actions it will seek the preservation of unity within, the attainment of wider union, and the avoidance of immediate contests on particular cases.

(3) The complete spiritual unity within the Church in South India which is the aim of the uniting Churches will not be attained till all the members of the united Church are willing and wishful to receive communion equally in all of its churches, and it is the resolve of the uniting Churches to do all in their power to that end.

They recognize that the act of union will initiate a process of growing together into one life and of advance towards that complete spiritual unity. If during this process difficulties and anomalies arise, the united Church will be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience by Church authorities or by majorities; nor will it in its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long-established traditions of any of the uniting Churches.

They believe that these ends can rightly be attained not by the framing of detailed regulations, but by assurances given and received in a spirit of mutual confidence and love.

They therefore pledge themselves and fully trust each other that in the united Church no arrangements with regard to churches, congregations or ministers will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would offend the conscientious convictions of any persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church or imperil its subsequent progress towards union with other Churches.

(4) The uniting Churches agree that every minister of the united Church who was ordained outside its area shall be at liberty to retain the ecclesiastical status (e. g. connexion with a home presbytery) which he had before the union in the Church in which he was ordained, subject to such arrangements between the united Church and any of the Churches concerned as may be found necessary, and provided that he shall not by any such arrangements be released from the obligations of his position as a minister of the united Church.

(5) The uniting Churches agree that every minister of the united Church shall be at liberty to exercise any ministry in a Church outside its area which he was entitled to exercise before the union; but this right can only be extended to such other Churches outside the area of the union as are willing to receive his ministrations.

(6) The uniting Churches agree that it is their intention

and expectation that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister.

For the thirty years succeeding the inauguration of the union, the ministers of any Church whose missions have founded the originally separate parts of the united Church may be received as ministers of the united Church, if they are willing to give the same assent to the Basis of Union and the same promise to accept the Constitution of the united Church as will be required from persons about to be ordained or employed for the first time in that Church. After this period of thirty years, the united Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.

(C) The Relation of the united Church to the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon

It is proposed that the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon should divide itself into two provinces in order to allow the southern province, consisting of the dioceses of Madras, Tinnevelly, Travancore and Dornakal (and if union extends to Ceylon, Colombo) to form with the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church in South India an autonomous united Church in South India (and Ceylon), the absence of any organic union with the northern province being accepted temporarily for the sake of unity, on the clear understanding that the united Church of the South will wish for and will endeavour to promote a similar union in the North, and on the conclusion of such a union will seek itself to be united to the Northern Church in an all-India united Church.

The united Church in South India would further, as being the successor in South India to the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, undertake certain obligations in respect of the maintained churches (as these are defined in the India

Church Act, 1927) and their congregations and the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment in South India, and in connexion with these obligations would maintain a special connexion with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, as described in detail in Section XII of this Scheme.

See also the explanatory note in Appendix A (p. 187).

(D) Relation of the united Church to the Wesleyan Methodist Church in respect of Chaplains' Work

The united Church will make provision in its constitution for the continuance in military cantonments of the ministry now carried on by the Wesleyan Methodist Church among those officially known as 'declared Wesleyans and other Nonconformists' in the British Army, in co-operation with the Superintending Wesleyan Chaplain in India and the Wesleyan Church authorities in England, if the Wesleyan and military authorities so agree.

The Wesleyan chaplains appointed to this work from time to time by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, and members of the Wesleyan and other Nonconformist Churches among British officers and men, will be welcomed as ministers and members respectively of the united Church, provided that they are willing that the constitution and rules of the united Church should apply to them as to the ministers and members of the uniting Churches.

Section V

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED CHURCH

It is proposed that the Constitution of the united Church should have the following arrangement of its chapters, and include the subjects of which a list is here given.

Drafts of the leading provisions which would be contained in the various chapters are given in the Sections of this

Scheme; when the Scheme had received the general assent of the governing bodies of the uniting Churches, the Constitution would be finally drafted for definitive adoption by them as part of the act by which they agreed to unite.

After the act of union the Constitution would be alterable by the Synod in accordance with the provisions for alteration contained in its last chapter.

List of Chapters of the Constitution and the Subjects to be included in them

I. *Preamble.*

II. *The Name of the Church.*

To be decided when the Constitution is finally drafted.

III. *The Governing Principles of the Church.*

To contain the matter of Section III of this Scheme (The Basis of Union), but redrafted as from the point of view of the united Church. Parts (C) and (D) of the Basis of Union might be transferred to Chapters V and IV of the Constitution.

IV. *The Membership of the Church.*

Definition of membership; admission to full or communicant membership; duties and privileges of membership.

See Section VI, p. 157, for draft of leading provisions.

V. *The Ministry of the Church.*

Bishops, their functions and reponsibilities; their election or appointment; their consecration; Presbyters, their functions and duties, their ordination; Deacons, their status and functions; the ministry of the Laity.

See Section VII, p. 158, for draft of leading provisions.

VI. *The Governing Bodies of the Church.*

The Pastorate Committee; the Diocesan Council; the Synod.

See Section VIII, p. 167, for draft of leading provisions.

VII. *The Worship of the Church.*

The freedom of worship; the Communion Service; the administration of Baptism; the use of Creeds in worship.

See Section IX, p. 173, for draft of leading provisions.

VIII. *The Discipline of the Church.*

General principles; Panchayats and other local courts; courts of Diocesan Councils; the Court of the Synod.

See Section X, p. 176, for draft of leading provisions.

IX. *The Marriage Law of the Church.*

See Section XI, p. 179, for draft of initial provisions.

X. *The Property and Finance of the Church.*

XI. *The Records of the Church.*

XII. *The Relations of the Church with other Churches.*

Of the Church as a corporate body; of its ministers and members; relation to the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon with regard to the Indian Church Statutory Rules; relation to the Wesleyan Methodist Church in respect of chaplains' work.

See Sections IV and XII, pp. 150 and 179.

XIII. *Alterations in the Constitution.*

See Section XIII, p. 182, for draft provisions.

Section VI

THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE CHURCH

(Draft of the leading provisions to be included in Chapter IV of the Constitution)

(1) The united Church acknowledges that the Church is the body of Christ and its members are the members of His Body; and that those are members according to the will and purpose of God who have been baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and, receiving the calling and grace of God with faith, continue steadfast therein, maintaining their vital union with the Head of the body, Jesus Christ, by the same faith, through the various means of grace which He has provided in His Church.

(2) The privileges and obligations of membership of the united Church belong to every person who, being resident in the area of that Church,

has been baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and

is willing to abide by the rules and customs of this Church, and

is not a member of any Christian body which is not in communion with this Church, and

is not excommunicated by lawful excommunication or an open apostate to some non-Christian religion.

(3) The privilege of participation in the government of this Church is confined to adult communicant members of this Church, the Synod, or a Diocesan Council, having the power to attach other conditions to the exercise of this privilege.

(4) A member of any Church in communion with this Church, when in consequence of residence in the area of this Church he accepts the privileges and obligations of membership in this Church, does not thereby sever his connexion

with the Church to which he previously belonged, or lose his right to enjoy the privileges of that membership on his return to the region of that Church's ministrations.

(5) Until the Synod of the Church shall frame general rules with regard to full or communicant membership, either the rite of confirmation administered by a bishop of the Church, or such a service of admission to full membership as was in use in the South India United Church before the union, or such a service for the recognition of new members as was in use in the Wesleyan Church in South India before the union, shall be employed in admitting persons to full or communicant membership of the united Church, and persons so admitted shall be recognized as communicants throughout the whole Church.

(6) In the preparation of candidates for baptism, the Apostles' Creed (or, if so desired, the Nicene Creed) shall be used as the basis of part of the necessary instruction. It shall not be necessary that, in answering questions with regard to their faith, candidates for baptism should use the actual words of either of these creeds in affirming their beliefs.

(7) (A paragraph on the duties and privileges of the members of the Church.)

Section VII

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

(*Draft of the leading provisions to be included in Chapter V of the Constitution*)

Part I. The Ordained Ministry

(*a*) *Bishops, their Functions and Responsibilities*

(1) The bishop of the diocese has the general pastoral oversight of all the Christian people of the diocese, and more particularly of the ministers of the Church in the diocese.

(2) The bishop of the diocese, acting in accordance with the rules laid down in this Constitution concerning the worship of the Church, shall acquaint himself with the various methods of worship and forms of service used in the diocese, shall advise the ministers and congregations in this matter, and shall cause to be prepared and shall issue special services and prayers as they may be required from time to time. He shall have authority in the case of grave irregularities in public worship to forbid their continuance, and any such prohibition shall remain in force pending any action which the Executive Committee of the Synod of the Church may take thereon.

(3) The bishop of the diocese, acting in accordance with such rules in the matter as may be laid down in this Constitution or by the Synod or by a Diocesan Council, shall receive the names of candidates for ordination who have been approved by the bodies and persons required by the rules, and shall make inquiries from the congregation in which the candidate is best known and also from persons to whom he is known (who shall include laity and not fewer than three ministers); and if he considers the candidate fit to be ordained, he shall bring his name before the Diocesan Council or some other body appointed for the purpose, and if it is agreed by the Council or by that body that the candidate should be ordained, the bishop may ordain him, provided he is assured that he will receive some charge or other definite work.

Note. Rules for the selection and training of candidates for ordination shall be laid down by the Diocesan Councils.

(4) The bishop of the diocese, acting in accordance with such rules in the matter as may be laid down in this Constitution or by the Synod, will give authorizations to ministers to officiate and to preach in the diocese. The location of the ministers shall also be carried out by the bishop of the diocese, after such consultation with diocesan committees

or other bodies as may be prescribed by the rules of the diocese.

(5) The bishop of the diocese alone shall have the power to pronounce sentence of suspension from Holy Communion or of excommunication in disciplinary cases, but he shall do so only after due inquiry has been made by the Pastorate Committee or Panchayat appointed for the purpose in accordance with the rules of the Diocesan Council. Similarly he shall have power on the recommendation of the Pastorate Committee or Panchayat to restore those that are penitent to the fellowship of the Church.

(6) Charges against a minister shall in the first instance be submitted to the bishop of the diocese, and he shall if possible settle the matter by personal inquiry and advice and, if necessary, admonition, or in grave cases temporary suspension of the authorization of the minister concerned. But if the bishop shall consider, or the accused minister demand, that the case should be referred to the Court of the Diocesan Council, it shall be so referred. A bishop may not withdraw his authorization permanently from a presbyter except by way of carrying out a sentence duly passed by the Court of the Diocesan Council, or in cases where the presbyter voluntarily submits himself to the decision of the bishop.

(7) The bishop of the diocese shall be president of the Diocesan Council, and shall have the right to take part in the proceedings of any standing committee, board or council of the diocese. He shall have the right of suspending the operation of decisions or resolutions of the Diocesan Council which directly concern:

(*a*) the faith and doctrine of the Church,

(*b*) the conditions of membership in the Church,

(*c*) the functions of the ordained ministers of the Church, or

(*d*) the worship of the Church and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the Church.

(See also Section VIII, B (3), p. 168.)

(8) Every bishop of a diocese shall *ex officio* be a member of the Synod of the Church.

(9) The bishop of the diocese shall not as bishop or as president of the Diocesan Council have any control over the finance of the diocese.

(10) The bishop of the diocese shall remain such for life, unless he resign, or accept the charge of another diocese, or depart permanently from the diocese, or be deprived of his charge by sentence of the Court of the Synod, or be adjudged by the Executive Committee of the Synod to be mentally or physically incapable of discharging the duties of his office.

(11) In the event of any bishop seeming to the Moderator [1] to be gravely unsuited to retain charge of his diocese it shall be the duty of the Moderator to take council with the other diocesan bishops, and if they concur in his judgement, to lay their views before the bishop concerned.

(12) The bishop of the diocese may appoint a commissary either under a general commission to act for him in the diocese during the bishop's absence from his diocese or incapacity to discharge his duties as bishop, or under a special commission to perform on his behalf some particular duty named in the commission. The appointment of a general commissary must be approved by the Executive Committee of the Diocesan Council.

A diocesan bishop cannot authorize his commissary to represent him in the Synod or in any committee or board thereof, or to exercise his suspensory power over decisions and resolutions of the Diocesan Council, nor can he (unless the commissary be himself a bishop) delegate to him his powers of ordination or of confirmation.

(*b*) *The Election, Appointment, and Consecration of Bishops*

(1) In every election of a bishop both the diocese concerned and the Synod shall have an effective voice.

[1] See Section VIII, C (2) and (3), pp. 170, 171.

(2) Both the Synod and the Diocesan Council shall have the right of making nominations of candidates to be voted upon by the Diocesan Council, but the nominations made by the Synod shall be of not more than three names, and shall not include the name of any person resident in the diocese.

(3) From the combined list of nominations the Diocesan Council shall elect not less than two and not more than four persons, all of whom must be supported by not less than two-thirds of the number of members of the Diocesan Council present and voting, and shall submit the list of their elections to a board consisting of the Moderator and six members appointed by the Executive Committee of the Synod. This board shall appoint a bishop for the diocese from among the names submitted by the Diocesan Council.

(4) The Diocesan Council may if it so desire remit the whole election to a Board of the Synod composed as in Rule 3.

(5) If a Diocesan Council fails within a prescribed time to fulfil the requirements of Rule 3 or Rule 4, a bishop shall be appointed for the diocese by the Executive Committee of the Synod.

(6) Every appointment of a bishop shall be subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee of the Synod, which shall for this purpose include all the diocesan bishops; but this confirmation may not be withheld except when either the election or appointment shall have been proved to have been invalid, or the Executive Committee shall judge the person appointed to be unfit in respect of character, conduct or teaching to exercise the functions of a bishop.

(7) The Synod will prescribe a form of consecration of bishops, in which, while provision may be made for extempore prayer and other elements of spontaneity and variety, there shall be certain invariable parts; these to include at least (i) a consecratory prayer, asking that the person to be consecrated may receive the gift of God's Holy Spirit for the

office and work of a bishop in His Church, and (ii) the laying on of hands at least by three bishops, with the words (if any) accompanying it. The consecration of a bishop shall normally take place in the course of the Communion Service.

(8) No person may be consecrated as bishop unless he has been ordained as a presbyter, and also attained the age of thirty years.

(*c*) *Presbyters, their Functions and Duties*

(1) It is the special function of presbyters to be dispensers of the Word of God and of His Sacraments, and to administer the discipline of the Church in accordance with its rules; and it is the rule of the Church that none except presbyters and bishops have the right to celebrate the Holy Communion.

(2) It is the duty of a presbyter in charge of a pastorate to be diligent in striving by all means in his power to bring the people committed to his charge into conformity with the mind of Christ, and in particular it is his duty:

(i) to lead the public worship of the congregation,
(ii) to administer the Holy Communion,
(iii) to teach and baptize,
(iv) to perform the other sacred services of the Church,
(v) to visit the congregation, and especially the sick and the erring,
(vi) to instruct the young, and to prepare candidates for confirmation or admission to communicant membership,
(vii) to lead his people preaching the Gospel, and
(viii) to encourage all efforts directed to the establishment of righteousness and the removal of wrong in the community.

(3) It is the duty of all presbyters, when summoned, to attend a meeting of the Diocesan Council, and meetings of the ministers which may be convened by the bishop from

time to time to discuss with them matters concerning their ministry and the faith, order and discipline of the Church or to advise them upon such topics.

(*d*) *Presbyters, their Ordination and Authorization*

(1) Candidates for ordination as presbyters, after receiving training under arrangements made or approved by the Synod, shall be selected and approved in the manner described in section A (3) of this Chapter, it being competent to each Diocesan Council to make further rules in the matter, consistent with that rule.

(2) The Synod will prescribe a form of ordination for presbyters, in which, while provision may be made for extempore prayer and other elements of spontaneity and variety, there shall be certain invariable parts; these to include at least (i) a prayer of ordination asking that those about to be ordained may receive the gift of God's Holy Spirit for the office and work of presbyters in His Church, and (ii) the laying on of hands by the bishop and presbyters, with the words (if any) accompanying it. The ordination of presbyters shall normally take place in the course of the Communion Service.

(3) Every person about to be ordained in any diocese of the Church will be required to affirm his sincere belief in the truths witnessed to by the Nicene Creed, and his acceptance of those included in the Governing Principles of the Church and in any other statement of doctrine which the united Church may have drawn up as a standard to which ministers must conform in their teaching.

At the same time, no acceptance of a written standard is sufficient for this or any of the purposes for which such standards are used without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ.

(4) Every person who is to receive authority to exercise other than an occasional ministry in a diocese of the united

Church shall make the same affirmation of his belief as those who are ordained within the united Church.

(5) Every person who is to be ordained presbyter, or to receive authority to exercise other than an occasional ministry in the united Church, shall declare his acceptance of the Constitution of the Church.

(6) No person shall be ordained presbyter until he has attained the age of twenty-four years.

(*e*) *Deacons, their Status and Functions*

(1) The united Church will continue the Diaconate, the functions of which may include:

(*a*) Assisting the presbyter in the administration of the Lord's Supper and in the other services of the Church,
(*b*) Administering baptism,
(*c*) Ministering in the temporalities of the Church,
(*d*) The ministry of succour to the poor, the needy and the sick,
(*e*) Instructing children and catechumens in the faith, and
(*f*) Generally giving assistance in pastoral and evangelistic work.

(2) Persons undertaking such a ministry for life shall be chosen in accordance with the rules of the Church, and shall be set apart for the ministry of a deacon by the laying on of hands by the bishop.

(3) Persons selected as candidates for the office of presbyter shall ordinarily, after undergoing the necessary theological course, receive ordination to the diaconate, and undertake the duties outlined in paragraph (1) above as part of their training for the presbyterate.

PART II. THE MINISTRY OF THE LAITY

(1) To the whole Church and to every member of it belongs the duty and privilege of spreading the good news of the Kingdom of God and the message of salvation through Jesus Christ. It is one of the main functions of the ordained

ministry to prepare the members of the Church to take their part both in the worship of God and in the service of man. The presbyter in charge of a pastorate should therefore welcome, and, so far as lies in his power, provide for the exercise by lay persons of such gifts of prophecy, evangelism, teaching and healing as God bestows upon them. The institution of the diaconate is not intended to limit the sphere of service of the laity in any way, but to meet special needs that cannot otherwise be met.

(2) The following are some of the ways in which the ministry of the laity may be exercised:

(*a*) *As Elders*

The united Church will continue the practice of setting apart lay persons to assist the pastor in the spiritual and administrative work of the Church and in its discipline.

Such persons may be set apart by a solemn service conducted by the bishop or some presbyter commissioned by him, after careful inquiry and examination in accordance with rules to be laid down by the Church.

An elder is set apart as such for life, but he will discharge the special duties of the office only when he is from time to time elected by the Pastorate Committee or by some other authoritative Church body to do so.

(*b*) *As Leaders or Pastoral Assistants*

Lay persons who are communicant members of the Church may be appointed to the charge of village congregations or of groups of Church members in a town pastorate, in order to assist the presbyter in the discharge of his pastoral responsibilities.

Note. Such persons may be appointed by the presbyter in conjunction with the Pastorate Committee.

Before any person is selected for such work, the presbyter shall by careful inquiry assure himself that he is of suitable religious character, possesses the necessary gifts, and is loyally attached to the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

Appointment to this office may carry with it membership of the Pastorate Committee.

The list of persons appointed to this office should be considered annually by the presbyter and the Pastorate Committee and revised as may be necessary.

(*c*) *As Lay Preachers*

Lay persons of suitable gifts and Christian experience who are communicant members of the Church may be authorized to preach in the public services of the Church.

Note. The authorization may be granted on the recommendation of the presbyter by the Pastorate Committee or a sub-committee appointed for the purpose.

Every person who desires the office of lay preacher shall satisfy the presbyter and the Committee concerned as to his suitability for the office and his acceptance of the Church's standards of faith. Courses of study may be prescribed during a period of probation.

Appointment to the office of lay preacher may carry with it membership of the Pastorate Committee.

The presbyter in charge of the pastorate is the person responsible for the services in the pastorate, and the lay preacher acts under his direction.

(*d*) *As Stewards* of Church funds, and administrators or trustees of Church property.

(*e*) *As Deaconesses and Women Workers.*

(*f*) *As Representatives on Church Bodies.*

The laity are in particular called upon to exercise important functions in the Church as members of its disciplinary Courts, and as representatives elected to its Councils and Synod.

Section VIII

THE GOVERNING BODIES OF THE CHURCH

(*Draft of the leading provisions to be included in Chapter VI of the Constitution*)

(A) The Pastorate Committee

(1) A pastorate is the sphere of a pastor (with his assistants, if any), consisting of one or more congregations, and constituted as a pastorate by the Diocesan Council.

(2) Every such pastorate shall have a Pastorate Committee, which shall consist of the pastor (the presbyter in charge) as chairman, and of lay communicant members of the Church elected by the communicants of the pastorate, and which may also include *ex officio* and nominated members in accordance with rules laid down by the Diocesan Council.

(3) The Pastorate Committee shall have, in conjunction with the pastor, the general oversight of the pastorate and all its religious activities. It may delegate certain of its functions to sub-committees or other bodies.

Rules will be laid down in the diocesan constitution defining the extent, the manner and the limitations of this oversight of the spiritual, financial and administrative work of the pastorate.

Provision should also be made in the diocesan constitution for general meetings of each congregation for purposes to be defined by the Diocesan Council.

(B) The Diocesan Council

(1) Every Diocesan Council shall consist of the bishop of the diocese, all the presbyters of the diocese holding the bishop's authorization and regularly engaged in the work of the Church, and lay representatives, whether elected, nominated or *ex officio*; and may include other ministers of the diocese, whether presbyters or deacons. Every Diocesan Council shall determine in its own constitution the number, necessary qualifications (which must include communicant membership of the Church), and method of election or nomination of the lay representatives in it.

(2) The bishop of the diocese shall be *ex officio* the president of the Diocesan Council.

(3) The bishop of the diocese shall have the right of

suspending the operation of decisions or resolutions of the Diocesan Council which directly concern

(*a*) the faith and doctrine of the Church,
(*b*) the conditions of membership in the Church,
(*c*) the functions of the ordained ministers of the Church, or
(*d*) the worship of the Church, and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the Church.

A decision or resolution so held in abeyance may be disposed of by agreement in a subsequent meeting of the Diocesan Council, and if not so disposed of shall be referred to the Synod for settlement.

In the absence of the bishop of the diocese, no Diocesan Council may make decisions or pass resolutions on such subjects.

(4) It is the duty of every Diocesan Council to make rules and pass resolutions and take executive action for the general management and good government of the Church in the diocese, subject to the provisions of this Constitution and in particular to those of Section (C) of this Chapter. The Diocesan Council shall be the ultimate financial authority of the Church in its diocese in all matters concerning its internal administration.

(5) Every Diocesan Council shall advise the Synod on all matters that may be referred to it by the Synod, and has power to bring business before the Synod.

(6) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, a Diocesan Council has power to frame, amend or alter its own constitution, but always with the approval of the Synod.

(7) It shall be competent to a Diocesan Council to combine several Pastorate Committees into a group, which shall be entrusted with administrative and financial functions within its area, such functions to be defined in the diocesan constitution.

(8) A Diocesan Council shall ordinarily meet once a year.

Note. It is the purpose of the uniting Churches that the dioceses of the united Church shall be so constituted as to make this practicable.

(C) The Synod

(1) *Membership.*

All bishops of the Church, and the officers of the Synod, shall be *ex officio* members of the Synod.

Three presbyters and three laymen shall be elected to the Synod by each Diocesan Council, and additional representation will be arranged in proportion to a fixed number of communicant members (e.g. one additional presbyter and one additional layman for each 3,000 communicant members above the first 3,000).

(2) *Officers.*

The officers of the Synod shall be a Moderator, a Deputy Moderator, a General Secretary, and a Treasurer.

All the officers shall be elected by ballot of the Synod.

The Moderator and Deputy Moderator shall be elected from among the bishops of the Church.

The Moderator and Deputy Moderator shall be elected during each Synod, and shall hold office from the close of that Synod till the close of the next Synod. They shall be eligible for re-election.

(3) *Duties of Officers.*

(*a*) The Moderator shall be the presiding officer of the Synod, and the Chairman of its Executive Committee. He shall be the official representative of the Church during his term of office in all business with other Churches or organizations.

(*b*) The Deputy Moderator shall preside at the Synod and perform the other duties of the Moderator during the absence, illness or other incapacity of the latter.

(*c*) The General Secretary shall keep a faithful record of all actions taken by the Synod, and shall keep its records and files. He shall be the correspondent between the Synod and the Diocesan Councils.

(*d*) The Treasurer shall hold all moneys belonging to the Synod, and shall from time to time submit accurate statements of his accounts to the Synod or to such other bodies as the Synod may direct.

(4) *Powers and Duties of the Synod.*

(*a*) The Synod is the supreme governing and legislative body of the united Church, and the final authority in all matters pertaining to that Church.

It has power to make rules and pass resolutions and to take executive action as is necessary from time to time for the general management and good government of the Church and of the property and affairs thereof.

It shall deal with matters of common interest to the whole Church, and with those which affect the relation of the dioceses to one another and to the rest of the universal Church, and shall leave the Diocesan Councils to deal with matters which concern only the members of the Church in each diocese.

It has the power to add to or otherwise alter the Constitution of the Church in the manner laid down in Chapter XIII of this Constitution.

It has the final authority in all questions of the interpretation of the Constitution and other official documents of the Church.

(*b*) The Synod has, in particular, power to determine the number and boundaries of the dioceses, and to approve of the constitutions of the Diocesan Councils, seeing that nothing in those constitutions is at variance with the Governing Principles of the Church and its Constitution.

(*c*) The Synod has power to frame its own rules of debate and of procedure.

The following persons or bodies have the right to bring business before the Synod: the officers of the Synod; any committee or board of the Synod; any Diocesan Council of the Church.

(*d*) The Synod shall appoint an Executive Committee, and other standing committees as it may deem necessary, and may from time to time appoint special committees or boards. The standing committees will include committees on union with other Churches, on life and work, &c.

(5) *Meetings of the Synod.*

The Synod shall meet once every two years at such time and place as the Executive Committee may determine. Special meetings of the Synod may also be called by the Executive Committee in urgent circumstances.

(6) *The Executive Committee of the Synod.*

The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Synod (who shall be the officers of the Executive Committee), all the diocesan bishops of the Church, and one presbyter and one layman elected by the Synod from among the representatives of each diocese in the Synod. The Executive Committee shall act as the *ad interim* committee of the Synod, and shall perform the other functions allotted to it in this Constitution.

(7) *Propositions on Faith and Doctrine, &c.*

When any proposition (in which term are included proposed enactments, statements and resolutions, and also forms of public worship) is brought before the Synod which directly concerns

(*a*) the faith and doctrine of the Church,

(*b*) the conditions of membership in the Church,

(*c*) the functions of the ordained ministers of the Church, or,

(*d*) the worship of the Church, and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the Church,

the matter shall be discussed in the Synod in the usual manner, but the proposition shall be submitted to the Synod for final voting thereon only in a form approved by the bishops sitting separately for that purpose.

The proposition when thus placed before the Synod may be discussed, and, if desired, be referred back to the bishops for further consideration and possible modification.

Such a proposition shall be declared to have been passed only if it obtains a two-thirds majority (or three-quarters, in the case referred to in Chapter XIII A of this Constitution) of the number of members of the Synod present and voting.

At any stage of its discussion, such a proposition may be referred by the Synod to the Diocesan Councils for their opinions.

If the bishops refuse to place such a proposition before the Synod for a final vote in any form whatever, or if the proposition fail to receive the support of the necessary majority, the matter shall be dropped for that meeting of the Synod, but may be brought forward again with due notice after an interval to be fixed by regulation of the Synod.

Section IX

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH

(*Draft of the leading provisions to be included in Chapter VII of the Constitution*)

(A) Freedom of Worship

In conformity with the principles laid down in Part E of the Governing Principles of the Church (Section III (E) above, p. 148),

(1) Every form of service which was used in any of the uniting Churches before the union may continue to be used after the union.

(2) Subject only to the provisions of this Constitution, and to any special regulations thereunder which may hereafter be issued by the Synod, every pastor and congregation of the Church shall have full freedom in determining the form of worship to be used on any occasion.

(B) The Service of Holy Communion

As the united Church grows in unity of mind and spirit, and experiences closer fellowship in worship it will no doubt develop a common form or forms of Communion Service adapted to its own needs. At first different forms will continue to be used.

The following, which already find a place in the services of all the uniting Churches, will be constituent parts of every Communion Service, the term 'service' being understood to mean either a single service, or two services of which the former (whether held on the same or a previous day) forms one whole with the actual Communion Service, and will be attended by those who will be communicants.

Constituent Parts of the Communion Service

(1) *Introductory Prayers.*

Note. When any set forms are used, it would be desired by many that these should include the almost universally used words of humble prayer, 'Lord, have mercy' (whether as the response to a litany or otherwise); and also a collect, or prayer, special to the day or occasion. The introduction might also contain a thanksgiving hymn, such as the 'Glory to God in the highest'.

(2) *The Ministry of the Word,* including readings from the Scriptures, which may be accompanied by preaching.

(3) *The Offering to God of the Gifts of the People.*

(4) *The Preparation of the Communicants* by confession of their sins, and the declaration of God's mercy to penitent sinners, whether in the form of an absolution or

otherwise, and such a prayer as 'The Prayer of Humble Access'.

Note. Portions or even the whole of these four sections may be incorporated in a previous service, provided that the communicants attend that service.

(5) *The Thanksgiving* for God's glory and goodness and the redemptive work of Christ in His birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension, leading to a reference to His institution of the Sacrament, in which His own words are rehearsed. This section should also contain a prayer that we may receive that which our Lord intends to give us in this Sacrament.

Note. Both on account of their antiquity, and as providing a worthy introduction to the thankful commemoration of our Lord's work, it is suggested that this section should begin with the phrases:

Minister: Lift up your hearts.
Answer: We lift them up unto the Lord.
Minister: Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.
Answer: It is meet and right so to do.
Minister: It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.
Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name: evermore praising thee, and saying,
Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, Heaven and Earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord most High.

(6) *An Intercession for the whole Church*, for whom and with whom we ask God's mercy and goodness through the merits of the death of His Son.

(7) *The Lord's Prayer.*

(8) *The Administration of the Communion*, with words conformable to Scripture indicating the nature of the action.

(9) *A Thanksgiving for the Grace received in the Communion*, with which should be joined the offering and dedication of ourselves to God, unless this has been included earlier in the service. This thanksgiving may be accompanied by an appropriate hymn.

(C) Baptism

In the administration of baptism, the following words shall always be used—'*N.* I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit'.

(D) The Use of the Creeds in Worship

The use of the Creeds in worship is an act of adoration and thanksgiving towards Almighty God for His nature and for His acts of love and mercy, as well as a joyful remembrance of the faith which binds together the worshippers.

While it is competent to the Synod to give directions concerning the occasions on which the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds may appropriately be used in worship, no authority of the united Church may forbid their use in worship.

Section X

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH

(Draft of the leading provisions to be included in Chapter VIII of the Constitution)

(A) General Rules

The ends of Church discipline are the good of the offender and the purity of the Church. The primary courts of discipline are—for bishops the Court of the Synod, for ministers the Court of the Diocesan Council, and for laity a local court or panchayat.

(B) The Local Court or Panchayat

(1) The rules at present in force for the administration of discipline by local courts or panchayats shall continue as at present in the different areas, until such time as the various Diocesan Councils of the united Church shall issue regulations, taking account of and so far as possible incorporating such local usages. In the case of major offences, recommenda-

tions will be made to the bishop of the diocese, who alone can issue sentence of excommunication.

(2) The accused person must receive notice of all charges brought against him, and be given an opportunity of being heard in his defence.

(C) The Court of the Diocesan Council

(1) The Court of a Diocesan Council shall consist of the bishop of the diocese, or a presbyter commissioned by him, together with presbyters and laymen appointed by the Diocesan Council.

(2) The Court of a Diocesan Council shall deal with charges brought against any minister of the diocese, when the bishop directs, or the accused minister demands, that the charges should be referred to it.

(3) The whole Court shall decide on the truth or otherwise of the charges brought against the accused minister, and upon any point of ecclesiastical law which may arise in the course of the proceedings, and, in the case of the accused being found guilty, on the sentence to be passed on him.

But when the charges against a minister relate to matters of faith and doctrine, the decision shall be framed and the sentence passed by the ministerial members of the Court only, the lay members acting as assessors.

(4) In all proceedings of a Court of a Diocesan Council the accused minister must receive notice of all charges brought against him and be given an opportunity of being heard in his defence, and, in the case of his being found guilty, in mitigation of sentence.

(5) An appeal on grounds of fact, law, or with reference to sentence, shall lie from every judgement of a Court of a Diocesan Council to the Court of the Synod.

(6) The Council of every diocese may make rules, consistent with the provisions of this Constitution, for all matters concerning the Court of the Diocesan Council and

the discipline of the ministry for which provision is not made in this Constitution.

(D) The Court of the Synod

(1) The Court of the Synod shall be elected by the Synod with such membership and in such manner as shall be laid down in this Constitution, provided that at least one-third of its members shall be bishops.

(2) The Court of the Synod shall sit as a court of appeal from decisions of Courts of Diocesan Councils.

(3) When the Court of the Synod is hearing an appeal from any Court of a Diocesan Council, neither the bishop of that diocese nor any other member of the Synod who belongs to that diocese shall be a member of the Court.

(4) The Court of the Synod shall also sit as a court for the trial of any bishop against whom a charge is brought, and shall on such occasions include all the other bishops.

In the trial of a bishop the whole Court shall decide on the truth or otherwise of the charges brought against him, and upon any point of ecclesiastical law which may arise in the course of the proceedings. If the bishop be found guilty, the bishops alone shall pass sentence upon him. But when the charges against a bishop relate to matters of faith and doctrine, the decision shall be made by the bishops alone, the other members acting as assessors.

In the trial of a bishop, no member of the Synod who belongs to the diocese of that bishop shall be a member of the Court.

(5) No decision or judgement of the Court of the Synod shall be subject to appeal to or revision by any person or court outside this Church.

Section XI

THE MARRIAGE LAW OF THE CHURCH

(*Draft of the provision initially to be included in Chapter IX of the Constitution*)

The marriage law and rules now observed in the dioceses, councils and synods of the uniting Churches shall continue after union until the Synod of the united Church shall enact its own marriage law and rules.

Section XII

THE RELATION OF THE UNITED CHURCH TO THE INDIAN CHURCH STATUTORY RULES AND TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INDIAN CHURCH

In pursuance of the general scheme set forth in Section IV (C) of this Scheme, the following detailed arrangements are proposed:

(1) The united Church will by provisions in its Constitution make the following undertakings, to hold so long as the Statutory Rules made under the Indian Church Act 1927 are in force:

(*a*) All chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment in the area of the union shall have the right to use the services contained in the Book of Common Prayer from time to time legally authorized in England when ministering in a maintained church or elsewhere to a congregation which includes members of the Church of England temporarily resident in India and which worships in the English language, and every maintained church shall be available for such services.

(*b*) The united Church will supply episcopal supervision to the chaplains employed by Government as Church

of England chaplains, and episcopal ministrations in the maintained churches.

(*c*) Those chaplains shall not be refused a licence by a bishop of the united Church except for the causes which entitle a bishop of the Church of England to refuse to institute or admit a clergyman presented to a benefice in England.

(*d*) Bishops of the united Church will give notice to the Local Government before commencing disciplinary proceedings against any chaplain.

(*e*) The united Church will not enforce any rule or do any administrative act contrary to the Statutory Rules in reference to the maintained churches, their congregations, and the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment.

(2) The congregations of the maintained churches and the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment will be congregations and ministers respectively of the united Church, and will be represented or sit in its assemblies.

The Constitution of the united Church will apply to them as to other congregations and ministers, except in regard to the special matters stated above.

(3) In order to deal with business involved in the obligations which it undertakes with reference to maintained churches and their congregations and the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment the united Church will send bishops, presbyters, and laymen as representatives of its dioceses to meet the representatives of the dioceses of Northern India in an assembly which will be the General Council referred to in the Indian Church Act 1927.

The General Council will have the following duties:

(*a*) The approval of the General Council will be required to any legislation of the united Church which affects the maintained churches or their congregations or

the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment in respect of the rights accorded to them or the responsibilities entrusted to them under the Statutory Rules.

(*b*) It will be able to propose to the Synod of the united Church and to the Provincial Council of the dioceses of northern India legislation with regard to the aforesaid churches, congregations, and chaplains, such legislation to receive the assent of those two bodies before it is finally adopted by the General Council.

(*c*) It will have the duty of electing a Statutory Rules Board which the Bishop of Calcutta will be bound to consult before proposing to the Governor-General of India in Council any alteration in the Statutory Rules or giving his concurrence to any alteration in them proposed by the Governor-General of India in Council; and it will be able through that Board to make suggestions for alterations in those Rules.

(*d*) It will have the duty of appointing new Trustees to the body of Indian Church Trustees, and of giving directions, or appointing a committee or committees to give directions, to the Indian Church Trustees.

Note. The Indian Church Trustees are a body concerned with all-India, as distinct from diocesan, property of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, i.e. property in which both the united Church in the south and the northern dioceses will be interested. Hence it is suitable that new trustees should be appointed to it by the General Council as here defined and that the General Council should give directions to it.

(4) The united Church will by provisions in its Constitution accord to such congregations (other than those of the maintained churches) as consist entirely or predominantly of persons brought up in the Church of England in England,

or of persons who are accustomed to the use of the services of the Book of Common Prayer in the English language, the same right of using that Book as is granted by Statutory Rules to the congregations of maintained churches.

Section XIII

ALTERATIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED CHURCH

(*Draft of the leading provisions to be included in Chapter XIII of the Constitution*)

(A) Alterations in the Governing Principles of the Church

The following procedure shall be necessary for the making of any alteration in Chapter III of this Constitution, on the Governing Principles of the Church:

(1) The proposal for such an alteration must be brought before the Synod by one or more Diocesan Councils of the Church.

(2) The resolution for the alteration must be passed by the Synod.

(3) The resolution so passed must be accepted in substantially the same terms by two-thirds of the Diocesan Councils.

(4) If the resolution be so accepted by the Diocesan Councils, it must again be considered by the Synod, and passed in substantially the same terms by a three-quarters majority of the Synod.

(B) Alterations in other parts of the Constitution

The following procedure shall be necessary for the making of any alteration in this Constitution other than one in the Governing Principles of the Church:

(1) The proposal for such an alteration must be brought

before the Synod by one or more Diocesan Councils of the Church.

(2) The resolution for the alteration must be passed by a two-thirds majority of the Synod.

(3) The resolution so passed must be ratified by two-thirds of the Diocesan Councils of the Church.

Section XIV

FINANCIAL QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE UNION

(The Joint Committee has not been able to examine in detail the financial implications of the proposed union, and has instructed its Continuation Committee to do so, and to prepare at an early date a memorandum on the subject, and to present that memorandum to the authorities of the Churches engaged in the negotiations and (through the proper channels) to the Missionary Societies which support the work of those Churches in the area of the union.

The Joint Committee, however, sees no reason to anticipate that the union, and the changes in organization thereby involved, would throw any large new burden on the uniting Churches, or entail requests for large special help from abroad.)

Section XV

THE INAUGURATION OF THE UNION

(A) The Appointment of Bishops in addition to the existing Bishops

Under the proposals made in Section XVI of this Scheme, the dioceses of the united Church will not be established till perhaps five years after the inauguration of the union, and in any case they would not come into existence before the date of union.

The Joint Committee therefore proposes that the bishops who are to be consecrated at the inauguration of the union should be selected and appointed as follows:

(*a*) That the final selection and appointment of those bishops be made by a central body composed of representatives of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, the General Assembly of the South India United Church, and the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church;

(*b*) that this central body make its selection from lists of names to be submitted by the central authorities of the uniting Churches in the area of the union, which they should prepare in consultation with the synods and councils under them, indicating in their lists the language area or areas to which each person proposed could most appropriately be appointed as bishop.

(B) The Act of Inauguration of the Union

The outstanding act which will truly inaugurate the union of the Churches will be the partaking of the Holy Communion by those assembled as the ministers and members of one Church.

But there are certain other acts which must first be done in order to bring the Church into this condition of unity with a completed and united ministry.

The Joint Committee, therefore, suggests the following order of proceedings:

(1) The bringing solemnly before God of the making of union, and asking His blessing upon it.

This might be done by the laying upon the Communion Table by a representative of each of the uniting Churches a signed copy of the Constitution of the united Church, after reading the declared assent of his Church thereto;

this being followed by prayer by a representative of each of the uniting Churches for God's acceptance of the union and His blessing upon it.

(2) Prayers by representatives of the ministries of the uniting Churches, asking God to accept and bless the work of the ministry of the united Church.

(3) Declaration by the existing bishops of their assent to the Governing Principles and their acceptance of the Constitution of the united Church.

(4) The consecration of the new bishops. This should contain the following six parts:

(*a*) The presentation of the bishops-elect to the presiding bishop by accredited representatives of the Churches to which they have previously belonged, who will read resolutions of the governing bodies of those Churches signifying their approval of their appointment.

(*b*) Intercessory prayer, in the form either of extempore prayer or a short litany.

(*c*) The public examination of the bishops-elect, in the form of set questions and answers, with regard to such matters as their assurance of God's call, their faith, their resolve to guard the purity of the Church's faith and morals by a due exercise of discipline, and their readiness to undertake the duties of a bishop.

(*d*) The consecratory prayer, said by the presiding bishop, asking God to grant to the bishops-elect the gift of His Holy Spirit to enable them rightly to perform the duties of the bishop's office.

(*e*) The laying on of hands jointly by the presiding bishop and at least two other bishops and by presbyters of the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church, with or without accompanying words.

(*f*) The delivery to the bishops who are being consecrated of the Bible, to set before them their duty continually to study and teach the Word of God.

(5) The Communion Service.

Note. The proceedings of para. (4) may take place after the introductory portion of the Communion Service.

Section XVI

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DIOCESES OF THE UNITED CHURCH, AND TRANSITORY PROVISIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION

(1) The Joint Committee believe that it is of vital importance to the well-being of the united Church that territorial dioceses should be established at the earliest possible date, and hopes that the uniting Churches will declare their intention that the complete realization of this principle shall be effected not later than five years after the inauguration of the union.

(2) At the same time it is apparent that the immediate establishment of exactly demarcated dioceses in an area where the three uniting Churches already possess established district synods and councils cannot be at once effected without causing great confusion in existing financial and administrative arrangements, especially since the spheres administered by these bodies are in few if any cases coterminous.

(3) There are, however, in the area of the united Church certain more or less homogeneous groups which would naturally grow into territorial dioceses, and it is suggested that definite steps should be taken to plan for this growth by initiating in such areas, immediately upon the final acceptance of the scheme of union by the governing bodies of the uniting Churches, an interchange of representation on the existing administrative bodies, and by establishing in each such area a common council with at first merely advisory powers.

(4) If this conception of the growth of the dioceses of the united Church be accepted, the new bishops appointed at the inauguration of the union should be designated for work in particular areas, but not have constitutionally established rigidly demarcated dioceses. The bishop in each such area would at first work in conjunction with the existing bishop and the chairmen of the synods or councils operating in that area. Duties of supervision in ecclesiastical matters would be from the first handed over to him, and the amalgamation and correlation of the administrative bodies in the area with the future Diocesan Council would be taken in hand at once by him, to be completed during the first five years.

(5) During this interim period the Synod could be composed of all the bishops, and of presbyters and laymen elected for the purpose either by the advisory diocesan councils (if such should have been formed) or by arrangement between the representative bodies of the uniting Churches in each diocesan area.

(6) In connexion with these proposals, and possibly also for some other matters, certain Transitory Provisions will have to be included in the Constitution of the united Church; these can be drafted at a later stage.

APPENDIX A

Explanatory Note on Section IV (C)

(1) At an early stage of the negotiations for union, it was agreed that while the Church of England in India as a whole was taking part in them, its southern dioceses only should actually be included in the union. This decision was made partly on the ground, which after 1930 will not obtain, that the Church of England in India was under State control, but also on grounds which have still the same force as when they were first stated, viz. (i) that while in South India the Churches concerned are preponderatingly Indian in member-

ship and have, at any rate among their leaders, a keen desire for union, the corresponding Churches in North India are at present much more largely European in membership and are only beginning to look definitely towards union; and (ii) that the Christians in South India form a relatively homogeneous group, Dravidian in language and race, which is sharply distinguished from the Northern group.

(2) The negotiations having reached a more developed stage, the problem has emerged of the relation of the proposed united Church in South India to the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, and that in two ways—

(*a*) The southern dioceses of that Church, while strongly desiring the union in South India, and wishing to be part of the united Church as a distinct province of the universal Church, are naturally reluctant that that province should have no kind of organic connexion with the northern province of the all-India Church to which they have previously belonged.

(*b*) The Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon has, under the Indian Church Act 1927, undertaken certain all-India obligations in respect of the maintained churches and their congregations and the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment, and it is essential that means be found whereby either the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon as a whole, or the united Church as its successor in South India, shall be able to fulfil those obligations.

(3) It has been considered whether these two needs could be met by arranging that the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon should as a whole enter into union with the South India United Church and the South India Province of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

This united Church would consist of two provinces, the northern province being for the present purely Anglican and retaining its present constitution in the form of a provincial

constitution, while the southern province would be, so to speak, a union province and would have the constitution outlined in this Scheme. The two provinces would have as their link of organic union a General Council which might have definite legislative authority over the whole Church in respect of matters concerning the maintained churches, their congregations and the chaplains, and in whose hands alone (with the consent of the two provincial councils) would lie the powers of alteration of some brief set of General Principles of the whole Church, but which would have no further authority over the two provinces. The Joint Committee feels, however, that this arrangement would have the appearance, and even something of the reality, of the absorption of the South India United Church and of the Wesleyan Church in South India in the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, and is convinced that it could not be accepted by the governing bodies of those Churches.

(4) A solution of the difficulty which would seem in some ways very simple would be that the congregations of the maintained churches and the Government chaplains in South India should not be included within the scope of the union, but should continue to belong to that part of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon which will not be in direct union with the other Churches. But apart from the very serious practical difficulties of removing these congregations and chaplains from the charge of the bishop of Madras and dealing with them as part of one of the northern dioceses, this would be to divide the Church in South India racially, and the Joint Committee is convinced that this solution has only to be stated to be rejected.

(5) The solution here put forward is—

(*a*) that as the Wesleyan Church in South India will by the union lose (only temporarily, it is hoped) its organic union with the North India Province of the Wesleyan Church in India and with the world-wide Wesleyan Church,

and as a part of the all-India Presbyterian Church separated itself from that body to become a part of the present South India United Church, so the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon should be asked to make this sacrifice of losing its organic unity as a temporary measure, it being confidently expected that if the union is successfully carried through in the South, a similar union (discussion of which has, indeed, already begun) will before long be carried through in the North also, and that those two united Churches will then form an all-India United Church ; and

(*b*) that till this happens, the united Church in South India, being, as it truly will be, the successor to the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon in South India, and in one aspect being that same Church, enriched by the union with itself of the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church in South India (as in other aspects it will be each of those Churches enriched by the union with itself of the other two Churches), should accept the duty of fulfilling in South India the obligations of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon with regard to the maintained churches and their congregations and the chaplains of the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment, and give full constitutional guarantees for its so doing, while such actions in connexion with these matters as have to be taken directly by an all-India authority should be taken by the Metropolitan and by a General Council which should have authority in those matters and in those only.

This plan is worked out in detail in Section XII of this Scheme,[1] and the Joint Committee believes that such an arrangement would be compatible with the wording and not contrary to the real intention of the Indian Church Act. It might require a slight modification of the Statutory Rules, which it is hoped the Metropolitan would be willing to propose to the Government of India in Council.

[1] p. 179.

APPENDIX B

Names of Diocesan Districts or Councils.	*Communicants.*	*Other baptized persons.*	*Unbaptized adherents.*	*Total.*
Dornakal . .	29,000	74,000	54,000	157,000
Madras . .	12,000	38,000	—	50,000
Tinnevelly . .	37,838	68,155	5,549	111,542
Travancore .	27,524	47,987	1,830	77,341
Total Anglicans	106,362	228,142	61,379	395,883
Hyderabad .	7,509	56,960	6,876	71,345
Mysore . .	4,269	6,267	257	10,793
Trichinopoly .	1,726	12,219	3,626	17,571
Madras . .	3,683	7,281	883	11,847
Total Wesleyans	17,187	82,727	11,642	111,556
Madras . .	7,207	16,124	5,886	29,217
N. Tamil . .	1,069	8,705	1,325	11,099
Travancore .	16,048	69,244	28,438	113,730
Madura . .	9,963	13,282	5,322	28,567
Kanarese . .	541	1,363	80	1,984
Jaffna . .	2,581	1,000	172	3,753
Telugu . .	2,705	24,627	8,391	35,723
Malabar (1924) .	3,635	3,697	30	7,362
Total S.I.U.C. .	43,749	138,042	49,644	231,435
Grand Total .	167,298	448,911	122,665	738,874

140. The South India United Church

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. OCTOBER 1929

Resolved that the following report[1] of the Committee be received and sent to the Councils with the 'Proposed Scheme of Union' prepared by the Joint Committee on Union for their consideration and action.

[1] Report of Special Committee on Church Union, Document No. 141, *infra.*

I. The Assembly adopted the following resolutions:

1. Resolved to recommend to the Church Councils the Scheme of Union for their careful study, and to suggest that wherever possible members of the Joint Committee, both Anglican and Wesleyan, be invited to the meetings of the Councils to explain any matter in the Scheme that may seem ambiguous.

2. In referring the Scheme to the Councils the Assembly desires to make the observation that if a union of our Church with the Anglican and the Wesleyan Churches is to be accomplished that can be done only by formulating a Scheme which will secure that the Church will be a common spiritual home for the various schools of thought and practice in the uniting bodies on a basis of mutual toleration and respect, and not by attempting to secure uniformity.

II. Resolved that, in the light of the discussion, the Assembly recommend that the Councils consider the desirability of adopting the following modifications of the Scheme and declarations:

1. That para. 1 in Sect. III (B) [p. 147] be modified by deleting the words—'without intending . . . episcopacy', and adding instead the following sentence:

'In doing so they declare their intention that no particular theory regarding episcopacy shall become the official doctrine of the united Church; and they do not commit themselves to the position that episcopal ordination is the dividing line between a valid and an invalid ministry.'

The paragraph would then read as follows:

The uniting Churches, recognizing that the episcopate, the councils of the presbyters, and the congregation of the faithful must all have their appropriate places in the order of life of the united Church, accept in particular the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of their basis of union. In so doing they declare their intention that no particular theory regarding episcopacy shall become the official doctrine of the united Church; and they do not

commit themselves to the position that episcopal ordination is the dividing line between a valid and an invalid ministry.

2. That a provision be incorporated in the Scheme that presbyters shall take part along with the bishops in all subsequent consecrations of bishops and not only at the consecration of the first bishops, and that the relevant clauses in Sect. III and VII be suitably modified.

3. That in accepting para. (2) Sect. IV B [p. 151], we declare that it is not our intention that the freedom of intercommunion and inter-celebration shall be restricted to any section of the Church or to the lifetime of the original ministers and members of the Churches entering the union, and that with a view to making this clear we suggest that in the last line of the first sentence of the para. the words 'these churches' be inserted in place of 'they'.

The paragraph would then read as follows:

While such authority must inhere in the united Church, it is the deliberate intention of the uniting Churches that none of the ministers or members of the united Church shall because of the union forgo any rights with regard to intercommunion and inter-celebration which these Churches possessed before the union.

4. That in para. 2 of Sect. IV B (6) [p. 153], the following addition be made to the last sentence, 'provided that the status of those who by that time have already been admitted shall not be affected'.

The sentence would then read as follows:

After this period of thirty years, the united Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry, provided that the status of those who by that time have already been admitted shall not be affected.

5. That no minister of the united Church shall be restrained from inviting to the Lord's Table members of other Churches who are communicants in good standing.

6. That while there is provision for the autonomy of the

individual church in the Scheme, we understand from Sect. VII, Part I, (*a*) 4 [p. 159], that there will be opportunity in the framing of the rules of the Diocesan Councils for giving due consideration to the views of the local churches.

7. That in regard to Sect. VII, Part I, (*a*) 3 [p. 159], we desire to state that if the bishop is not satisfied with the declaration of faith of a candidate for ordination, he shall consult the other bishops of the Church before making a decision.

8. That in regard to the powers of the Synod, after the bishops have stayed action in the Synod as in Sect. VIII, C (7) [p. 172], the matter thus stayed shall be dealt with in accordance with the principles laid down in Sect. XIII A [p. 182].

9. That with a view to reassuring those in the Church who are afraid that within a short time after the union the Synod might by a majority take action which would be contrary to the principles which at the time of union belong to one or other of the uniting Churches, it is hereby declared that it is contrary to the intention of those who make the union that any question on which the uniting Churches as such are divided or have differing practices (such as admission to communicant membership) be brought up within 30 years from the date of the union.

141. *The South India United Church*

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CHURCH UNION

(Presented to the General Assembly, October 8, 1929.)

FATHERS AND BRETHREN,

Your Committee on Church Union begs leave to report the work that it has done during the past two years. It was appointed at the Eleventh Assembly at Pasumalai, and there instructed to carry on negotiations with representatives of the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

Since then there have been two meetings of the Joint Committee in addition to a meeting of the Union Committee in which the reply to the Lausanne resolutions was drafted and questions regarding union were fully discussed. The first meeting of the Joint Committee was held in Bangalore in July, 1928. A second was held in Madras from February 26–March 8, 1929. Both of these meetings were of considerably more than usual interest. It was felt that the time had come when the Committee could prepare a complete scheme for presentation to the Churches; hence at the Bangalore meeting we not only discussed several important questions, but we appointed a Continuation Committee to which were referred other definite questions on which reports were to be prepared and presented to the next meeting of the Joint Committee. Sub-Committees of the Continuation Committees met and prepared statements. The Continuation Committee itself met in Madras in January, where it discussed further plans and prepared certain statements. When, therefore, the Joint Committee again met at the end of February, these statements were ready for their consideration. At that time the Joint Committee, with 42 members present, met for 10 days at the Wesleyan Hall in Royapettah and considered in greatest detail all those statements that had been prepared, modified them in many cases, and put them into such shape that the whole might be a consistent and complete scheme for union among these three Churches.

The Joint Committee throughout its session kept carefully before it the instructions that each section of that Committee had received from its own Church. *The Anglican Committee* had before it the following resolutions from the General Council of the Church in India, Burma and Ceylon, which they were instructed to consider in their further deliberations.

Resolved:

I. That we have received the report of the Joint Committee on Union with great thankfulness in that it

indicates the deepening desire for unity, and suggests a way to complete unity which we desire should be fully explored.

Remembering that the Constitutional Episcopate has been accepted for the united Church and that the clearly expressed intention is to secure an episcopally ordained ministry throughout the Church, we are prepared, with a view to bridging over the period till this is fully attained, that to all who, at the time of union, are ministers of the uniting Churches should be accorded after union the position of ministers of the Work and Sacraments in the united Church.

But just as we do not ask that the ministers of the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan Church should deny their life-long belief in the grace given to them through the laying on of hands, or that the members of these Churches should deny the validity of the Sacraments which they have been accustomed to receive, so we ask for respect for the beliefs of those who have learned to connect the grace given to them in the Holy Communion with an episcopally ordained ministry.

We therefore ask that the terms of union should provide that (*a*) by the union Anglicans be not deprived of any opportunities which they have previously enjoyed of receiving the Holy Communion at the hands of an episcopally ordained minister and (*b*) that conscientious convictions be safeguarded on the one side by a proviso that no non-episcopally ordained minister shall either temporarily or permanently be placed in charge of a congregation accustomed to an episcopally ordained ministry, and on the other side by any corresponding provisos which the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan Church may desire to formulate in order to protect the conscientious convictions of their own members.

Further, we desire that the Joint Committee should continue its labours, and that our delegates should secure a fuller discussion and elucidation of the following points:

1. The continuance of the Diaconate as one of the orders of the ministry.

2. The constituent elements of the Liturgy which it is hoped may become the Liturgy generally used in the united Church.
3. The form to be used in the consecration of Bishops and the ordination of Priests.
4. The number and character (territorial or otherwise) of the proposed dioceses.
5. The relation of the united Church to the Church of England in India and to other Provinces of the Anglican Communion.
6. The means and methods which will be employed to secure the growth of the uniting Churches into a living and effective unity.
7. The relation of the united Church to other Churches, and the conditions of inter-communion with them.
8. The reconsideration of the 50-year period mentioned in Resolution II of the Joint Committee, 1926.

II. That the Council instructs its delegates to submit a detailed scheme, including further information on the points enumerated, to the Metropolitan, who shall forward it to the Archbishop of Canterbury for consideration by the Lambeth Conference.

The Wesleyan delegates had also received instructions from their Church in the following resolutions:

The Provincial Synod rejoices at the growth of the understanding between the Churches that has been produced by the consultations on Union. While at this stage it does not commit itself to acceptance of all or any of the details thus far formulated, the Synod desires that the consultations shall continue.

The Synod requests that the Wesleyan representatives on the Joint Committee will give special attention to the following points:

(*a*) That the distinctive contributions that the Wesleyan Church has to make be sufficiently safeguarded as, for instance, the service of the laity in the Church as local preachers, stewards, &c., and the position of the Leaders' meeting in regard to Church discipline.

(*b*) While the real basis of unity must be spiritual and cannot depend on outward forms we recognize that

no organic union is possible save on a basis of Episcopacy. If, for the sake of union, constitutional Episcopacy is to be accepted, it can only be so as a method of Church government, it being understood that by such acceptance the non-Episcopal Churches do not abandon their view of the ministry and cannot accept any form of Episcopacy that involves such abandonment.

(*c*) That in safeguarding the rights of the individual conscience against the majority [as is attempted in paras. 1 (*a*) and (*b*) of the section on the Ministry of the united Church in the Report of the Seventh Session of the Joint Committee on Union] no room should be left for the tyranny of the individual over the majority. The Synod is convinced that this provision as it stands is not in the interests of peace and unity and desires that these paragraphs shall be so radically changed as to prevent the possibility of such tyranny.

(*d*) That there shall be no less freedom of inter-communion in the resultant Church than is now enjoyed by any of the uniting Churches.

(*e*) In the judgement of the Synod it will help greatly to further the spirit of Union between the consulting Churches, and in our own Church to enable us to carry our people with us, if even before union is consummated united worship and inter-communion between the consulting Churches can be made possible: the absence of inter-communion constitutes a most formidable obstacle to union in the minds of many of our people.

The Committee on Union of the S.I.U.C. had instructions from the Eleventh Assembly as expressed in the following resolution:

The Assembly instructs its Committee to report to the Joint Committee the views of the Church Councils as recorded in this report, together with the views of the two Councils which have not yet reported, and to confer with the other sections of the Joint Committee with a view to finding a solution of the problems of the ministry

and inter-communion more acceptable to the Church than those of the Sixth Meeting.

Immediately after the close of the meeting of the Joint Committee the report was placed in the hands of the Christian Literature Society, Madras, for publication, and several thousand copies of both the Indian and foreign editions were printed and have been sold. We are informed that only 50 copies of the foreign edition remain on hand. We also understand that the S.P.C.K. of London has printed its own edition and the C.L.S. has just received a request from the World Conference on Faith and Order of Boston, U.S.A., for permission to reprint the proposed scheme and they say that they wish to publish thirty thousand copies for free distribution.

It is evident from the distribution of the reports that a very wide interest indeed has been awakened, and we know from accounts in the newspapers and periodicals that not only many individuals but many groups and organizations have taken cognizance of our movement and are studying it with the keenest interest. It is everywhere recognized that our negotiations in South India are attempting to do something that is unique in the history of the Church Union Movements. There are at present many movements for union on foot but our movement in South India is the only one which is attempting to unite Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches. It is recognized that the success of our movement if achieved would necessarily very greatly affect similar movements in other lands and that when there has once been a union between non-Episcopal and Episcopal Churches, such a union movement must spread to other parts of the world.

It is natural, of course, that various individuals and groups have taken different attitudes with regard to the 'Scheme'. We understand from the papers that the Anglo-Catholics in Great Britain have taken serious objection to

certain aspects of the 'Scheme' and that they have practically declared that they cannot accept it. We are also told that individuals of a liberal attitude toward Christianity have objected to certain proposals regarding the faith and creeds of the 'Scheme'. Many bodies have not expressed any final judgement but seem to be studying the scheme with great care. Some individuals and groups, however, belonging to various bodies have commented most favourably upon the Scheme.

The proposed Scheme has also been before various voluntary Conferences in India. It was, for instance, the subject for discussion at the Pasumalai Conference in April and was also before the Conference on Church Union at Kodaikanal in May. Another conference was held in Vellore in September. In all these conferences there was free and open discussion and various opinions were thoroughly considered. From the published reports of these conferences it would seem that the majority of those present regarded Church Union between Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians as most desirable.

The Assembly Committee on Union, realizing that by the constitution of our United Church this Committee should report to the Assembly and that the Assembly should then submit 'The Proposed Scheme' to the various Church Councils for their consideration and opinion, wrote to each Church Council asking it to consider the report, and, if it wished to do so, to report to the Committee on Church Union any suggestion that it might have with regard to the 'Scheme' but not to take any final action either favourable or unfavourable.

Two Councils considered the matter and made suggestions to the Committee on Union. The other Councils have not taken action or at least have not reported any action to the Committee.

Soon after publishing the report all the members of our

Committee on Union who were present at the last two meetings of the Joint Committee issued 'A Letter Regarding the Proposed Scheme of Union to the Ministers and members of the S.I.U.C.'. In that letter they laid down three principles that had guided them and their fellow-members of the Joint Committee in all their deliberations. Those three principles were:

1. That no man must be asked to violate his conscience in entering the Union.
2. That this Union should not cut us off from any fellowship that we have hitherto enjoyed.
3. That we must recognize the principle of freedom in worship.

Your Committee feels that these three principles have been safeguarded throughout the whole 'Scheme of Union'.

It will not be possible in this report to take up all the matters dealt with in 'The Proposed Scheme', but the Committee feels that it should make mention of the following items:

In the first place the scope of union aimed at was a union between the three Churches mentioned. In the Assembly that met in Jaffna in 1923, a general invitation was issued to the Churches in South India believed to be sympathetic with the idea of union, with a view to secure their interest and co-operation, and if possible their participation in the negotiations. The Wesleyan Methodist Church was the only body to respond to this invitation. It must be remembered, therefore, that the 'Scheme of Union' does not contemplate a general union among all denominations at present, but includes only the three bodies which took part in the negotiations. In all further negotiations full consideration will have to be given to the desires of any body wishing to enter into the union. 'The Proposed Scheme' implies that after this union has been consummated efforts will be made to extend the scope of union.

The Committee feels very strongly that 'The Proposed Scheme' puts greater emphasis upon the spiritual character of the Church than any previous reports did. But it is manifest that whereas we all seek the highest possible spiritual attainments it was impossible in a proposal of this kind to do more than to assert that principle and try to work it out in the provisions for organic union. We believe that this has been done and that the great object of the union is to accomplish the spiritual union which Christ aimed at in His High Priestly prayer.

It must also be remembered, in connexion with the principle that no man's conscience is to be offended, that we cannot insist on absolute uniformity either in doctrine or in worship. The liberty we claim for ourselves may not be refused to others. We must frankly admit that any Scheme of Union of this nature must be comprehensive, though at the same time we may rightly ask that all those entering into the union shall regard each other as Christian brethren, members of the one household of God. Your Committee believes that by organic union as here proposed a much deeper spiritual union will result. As members of the one body in Christ we shall be brought much nearer to each other and thereby shall learn to know, respect, and love each other.

It is well to notice the progress that has been made in dealing with the questions of the ministry and inter-communion, which were specially entrusted to the Committee by the Assembly at Pasumalai. Different methods of dealing with the ministry had been suggested and rejected by one or more of the bodies negotiating. A dual ministry was suggested in the second meeting of the Joint Committee. A Commissioning service was put forth in another meeting. In the sixth meeting the Committee came very near a deadlock, as revealed in the Trichinopoly resolutions, and the Assembly did well to instruct the Committee to find a better solution. The Committee is very glad indeed to be able to

report that a much clearer understanding of the mind of one another became possible, as manifested in the last two meetings. All the ministers of the Churches at the time of union will become, by the act of union, ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the united Church. The only proviso is that in the working out of this fact no man's conscientious scruples shall be offended. This applies equally to all three Churches. The Joint Committee felt it was better to enter into the union with mutual respect and confidence than to attempt to draft minute regulations providing for all contingencies that might arise.

Your Committee feels satisfied that if the spirit of worship and fellowship that prevailed at the Joint Committee meetings could be shared by all, many matters connected with the union would no longer be considered as mere matters of law, but as a real adventure in faith in God and man.

This new spirit was specially evident in the consideration of the question of inter-communion where in former meetings one section of the Committee had very grudgingly granted a minimum of inter-communion. The last meeting of the Joint Committee definitely voted that the Church after union should be in full fellowship with all those with whom they had been in fellowship before, and the Committee also definitely expressed itself as looking forward to an ever widening circle of Christian fellowship. We, therefore, feel that very great progress was made in that subject.

In dealing with the various problems that arose the Joint Committee had before it the findings of similar Committees the world over and did not in all things have to devise new ways by which union should be effected. It will be remembered that the 'Interim Report' of a Joint Committee in England definitely recommended much of what is in our Basis of Union, especially the historic Episcopate and the acceptance of the creeds. The same was true of Committees

in Australia and elsewhere. It was also recognized by the Lausanne Conference that these must form the basis of union. It will also be remembered that the Committee in England continued its negotiations until it struck the rock of re-ordination, and that only then the negotiations came to an end. Your Committee has been able to advance beyond that point and neither re-ordination nor a commissioning service is now mentioned in the 'Scheme'.

In commending 'the Proposed Scheme of Union' to the General Assembly and asking it to submit the same to the Church Councils for their consideration the Committee suggests that the following points be kept in view:

Throughout the negotiations the Committee has kept in mind the principles for which our Church stands, and has tried to make sure that in the united Church the fullest liberty for the maintenance of these principles will be secured. We have also made it clear that we could take no step which would cut us off from the fellowship we now enjoy with the Churches of our origin and other Churches whose principles are similar. We believe that a careful study of the 'Scheme' will show that the representatives of the other two Churches have admitted the reasonableness of our claim and that the 'Scheme' has been drafted accordingly. See, e.g., the Statements on inter-communion contained in Sect. II (2) and Sect. IV (2); the Statement that Union is a reality in the spiritual realm (in the preamble of Sect. III); the Statements in the same section on the initial ministry of the united Church (C), of its membership (D), of worship (E), and autonomy (F). We regard these matters as settled, and we would feel bound to withdraw from the negotiations if any demand for their reconsideration were to be made.

But we hold that the recognition of our just claims in these matters carries with it an obligation on our part to recognize that those with whom we have been in negotiation, and specially the Anglicans, have also certain things which

they do not feel at liberty to give up. One of these is the acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and another, which from the Anglican point of view is of great importance, is the maintenance of connexion with the Church to which they now belong, which, in their judgement, would be broken if those to be appointed bishops in the united Church were to be consecrated in any other way than by the laying on of hands by not less than three bishops who were recognized as having obtained in a regular way the right to consecrate other Bishops. Similarly they would regard the continuity as broken if future ordinations were not conducted by a bishop whom they regard as regularly consecrated. They also regard the vesting of certain powers in the bishops, individually or collectively, as being for the welfare of the Church, and cannot be expected to adopt a scheme which would reduce these beyond a certain point.

The Committee thus considers that just as any attempt on the Anglican side to go back on what has been granted in recognition of our principles would mean the abandonment of the effort after organic union, any attempt on our part to break the continuity of the Church, or unduly to limit the powers of bishops, would have the same effect. The Committee accordingly hopes that Councils in considering the Scheme will be asked to keep this in view.

On the other hand there may be many matters of detail in which it is still possible to improve the 'Scheme'. It may, for instance, be possible to make certain statements regarding the conservation of our principles in the united Church clearer or more emphatic, and on the other hand it is conceivable that some modification of the powers of the bishops might be accepted by the Anglicans. So it is with certain other matters. While we have from the beginning accepted the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, there is room for consideration of the precise manner in which these are to be

accepted by individual ministers. Regarding such matters suggestions from Church Councils would be welcomed.

In presenting its report to the General Assembly your Committee on Union expresses its gratitude to Almighty God for having permitted it to complete its work and to present it to the Assembly. An honest attempt has been made all through the negotiations to carry out the instructions of the General Assembly and its Councils, and the Committee does not hesitate in commending the proposed scheme to the Assembly. In accordance with our Constitution and practice it now becomes necessary for the Assembly, which is in such matters an advisory body, to transmit this 'Proposed Scheme' to the various Church Councils for their consideration and their expression of opinion. In doing so we pray that the Wisdom of God may be both with the Assembly and with the Councils in their deliberations. May we in all things seek to know His Will and be ready to do it.

142. South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church

RESOLUTIONS ON CHURCH UNION

JANUARY 1930

1. The Provincial Synod received (*a*) the Report of its Committee on Church Union, (*b*) the Proposed Scheme of Union between the Anglicans, the South India United Church, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and (*c*) the Reports of the District Synods on that Scheme; and offers grateful thanks to Almighty God for the spirit of fellowship manifested and the large measure of understanding and sympathetic co-operation achieved.

2. Without any reference to the Scheme or the Reports from the District Synods, it was agreed, on the suggestion of the Chairman, that a vote should be taken on the general

question of Church Union and the following resolution was passed:

The Provincial Synod believes that organic Union is in the interest of the Kingdom of God in South India.

Vote: 32 For, 5 Against, 3 Neutral.

3. The Scheme was then considered and the following resolutions were passed:

(1) The Provincial Synod believes that on the whole the proposed Scheme of Union indicates a hopeful way of achieving a united Church in South India, but before the Synod is prepared to accept it considerable modifications will be necessary.

Vote: 34 For, 4 Against, 3 Neutral.

(2) The following are some of the modifications which the Synod considers desirable:

(*a*) *With reference to the Episcopacy:*

(i) Whilst we recognize that different views on the subject of Apostolic Succession may be held by members of the united Church there should be a more definite and explicit statement that it is not the intention of the Scheme that Apostolic Succession shall be a doctrine of the united Church. (See Resolution from the Trichinopoly Synod and the resolutions of the S.I.U.C. Assembly.)

(ii) There should be, in the written constitution, a clearer definition and limitation of the powers of the Bishop, including his power of veto, and the reception and stationing of ministers. (See Madras District Resolution 3 (*b*) and Trichinopoly District Resolution 4.)

(iii) Power should be given to a Diocesan Council to express its opinion, at regular intervals, to the Synod, as to whether it is in the interests of the work of God for its Bishop to continue in office in the diocese. (See Madras Resolution 3 (*a*).)

(iv) There should be a definite statement that no further ordination shall be required of any minister previous to his consecration as a Bishop. (See Mysore District Resolution.)

(*b*) *With reference to the Ministry:*

That whilst we agree 'that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister', we do not thereby cease to recognize the validity of the ministry of non-Episcopal Churches.

4. The Provincial Synod reappoints its Committee on Church Union and instructs it to collect and systematize the above, and any other suggestions that may be brought to its notice, for the guidance of our representatives in any possible future meeting of the Joint Committee, and for presenting a further report to the District and Provincial Synods.

5. As the Scheme of Union is now available, the Provincial Synod urges that in each district all possible assistance shall be given so that there may be a thorough understanding of the Scheme by our people.

6. The Provincial Synod will have to ask the Missionary Committee at a later stage to request the Conference to give an indication of its attitude on the following:

(1) The status of the ministers of our Church (both Indian and English) who shall enter the united Church, in relation to the Methodist Conference in England.

(2) The position of ministers who shall in future be ordained in the united Church, in relation to the Methodist Church in England.

(3) The relation, spiritual, administrative, and financial, of the Missionary Committee, after the union, to the missionary work now carried on by the Wesleyan Methodist Church in South India.

In the meantime the Standing Committee is instructed to give its attention to the subject and to report to the next Synod.

7. The Provincial Synod reaffirms the following resolution of the Synod of 1929 with reference to 'inter-communion'

and instructs that it be sent at once to the Episcopal Provincial Synod now meeting in Calcutta, with the suggestion that it would be in accordance with the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal if unfettered fellowship in the Holy Communion as between the three consulting Churches in South India were encouraged even before the union takes place.

In our judgement, it will help greatly to increase the spirit of unity between the consulting Churches, and within our own Church to win the mind of our people, if, even before union is consummated, united worship and especially inter-communion between the consulting Churches can be made possible. The absence of inter-communion at this time constitutes a most formidable obstacle to union in the minds of many of our people.

8. The Synod appoints the Rev. W. E. Tomlinson to take the place of the Rev. H. Gulliford on the Continuation Committee of the Joint Committee. If an emergency meeting of the Joint Committee is called this year, which is not likely, the three members of the Continuation Committee belonging to our Church—Messrs. Ponnaiya, Hooper, and Tomlinson—are empowered to select the delegates with the instruction to preserve continuity in the delegation as far as possible.

9. The Committee on Church Union shall consist of the Chairman and Secretary of the Provincial Synod, the Chairmen of Districts, Revs. J. W. S. Rungaswamy, S. A. Vedanayagam, J. J. Ellis, A. C. Hall, N. G. Ponnaiya, P. S. Rangaramanujam, F. C. Sackett, E. L. Ananta Rao, W. E. Tomlinson, F. Whittaker, M. B. Taylor, M. Mehta, P. Gurushanta, G. S. Marris, Miss Horwood, Messrs. S. Gnanapragasam, W. Jeevaratnam, K. Mon Singh, J. H. Sivasubramaniam, with J. S. M. Hooper (Convener).

10. The Synod wishes to place on record its gratitude to Mr. Gulliford for the services he has rendered in connexion with the consultations for Church Union. His great know-

ledge of Methodism has been of the utmost value to us, whilst his clear vision, his progressive mind, and his passionate devotion to the cause of union have made him a leader it has been an honour to follow. To his sympathy with the views of those who differ from him and his patience in dealing with criticism has been due, in a large measure, the frank and brotherly way in which differences have been discussed and agreements reached. The Synod feels confident that during Mr. Gulliford's visit to England, it can entrust to him the responsibility of representing to the Church at Home the difficult subjects that are engaging our attention and the differing views that are found in our Church in South India.

J. S. M. Hooper,
Chairman, South India Provincial Synod.

143. The General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon

Resolutions concerning the Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India passed by the General Council at its Fourth Session

February 1930

Prefatory Note by the Episcopal Synod

In publishing these Resolutions on behalf of the General Council the Episcopal Synod desires to make it clear that the purpose of the Council was not to pass a final verdict upon the Scheme of Union, but to state as clearly and frankly as it could its own opinion at the present stage, and at the same time to give instructions for the guidance of its Delegates, when they should resume their work upon the Joint Committee.

There were two chief reasons why the Council did not

wish to issue anything in the way of a final verdict. The first reason was that the Lambeth Conference is about to meet, and the Council considered that in such an important matter as this Scheme of Union it should not attempt to arrive at final conclusions until the General Council, and also the Diocesan Councils which are yet to pronounce upon the scheme, had availed themselves of the counsel which that body would be able to give. The other reason was that the Council was deeply conscious that the Holy Spirit by inspiring the Joint Committee with mutual trust and common desire to learn the truth as God should reveal it had enabled its members, who started with many and great divergencies of thought and tradition to arrive at agreement on a great many important points; and therefore wished to show by the terms of its Resolutions its belief that the continuance of such discussions is the surest and quickest way to ensure that the uniting Churches shall reach such real agreement upon all essential points as is necessary for a true and stable union.

But, though these Resolutions do not claim to be a final and unalterable expression of opinion by the General Council, yet they do represent a real common mind at which it arrived during its Fourth Session. The First Resolution of brotherly greeting was passed unanimously when the Scheme was received and before the Council proceeded to its detailed consideration. The Second Resolution was the fruit of three full days' discussion of the whole Scheme. Except for one small item which was passed with two dissentient votes, every part of this Resolution was adopted either unanimously or *nemine contradicente* by the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity voting together; and the Resolution thus indicates a solid and united opinion which the Council reached during a period when it was humbly conscious of being guided by the Holy Spirit into common understanding and agreement.

The Episcopal Synod is asking the Lambeth Conference to give its opinion and advice both on the Scheme as at present proposed and on the Resolutions passed by the General Council. The Synod also intends to ask the advice of the Conference on certain points, chiefly of a technical nature, upon which the Council and the Synod did not feel themselves competent to offer an opinion without seeking further counsel.

Signed on behalf of the Episcopal Synod,

Foss Calcutta.

Calcutta. February 10, 1930.

Resolution I

The Members of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon desire, on the occasion of receiving the Draft Scheme of Union prepared by the delegations of the Wesleyan and South India United Churches with their own delegation, to send a greeting to those Churches. They wish them to know that equally with them they are earnestly desirous of promoting that unity of His people for which our Lord Jesus Christ prayed and they are supremely thankful to God for the manifest working of His Spirit in the Churches in India and for the spirit of sympathy, mutual trust, and of loyalty to the truth which has characterized the negotiations throughout. They would assure them that they themselves desire no less than the other negotiating Churches to show the same spirit of sympathy and mutual trust and, while earnestly exploring every approach to unity, to bring into the united Church whatever of truth they have inherited. They request the Churches to unite with them in earnest prayer that all whose counsel will be sought, whether in the Lambeth Conference or in the Councils of Churches in England and America, may be guided by the Holy Spirit, and that the negotiating Churches in India

may be so filled with the spirit of love, of trust, and of loyalty to truth that they may be found worthy to restore in this part of the Church at least the broken unity of the Body of Christ.

Resolution II

The General Council recognizes with great thankfulness that the Joint Committee has been guided by Almighty God to base the Scheme of Union upon the acknowledgement of essential truths and principles of the Christian Religion which the Church has ever held; namely, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation of the Son of God, the authority of the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds as witnessing to and safeguarding the Faith, the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, and Christ's gift of the Ministry of His Church.

It observes with equal thankfulness that the Committee has been guided to seek the achievement of union by unifying the Ministry through adoption of the rule of episcopal ordination; and it desires to express its grateful appreciation of the service which has been rendered to the common cause by those who have been willing to change their customs in order to make this possible.

The Council believes that the Committee has thus been led to produce a situation in which it is possible to proceed towards the realization of that union which our Blessed Lord desires His people to have without passing judgement upon any particular form of Ministry or view of the Ministry. It believes that the Committee has thus been enabled to bring the negotiations into an atmosphere of mutual love and trust in which all can be sensible that the things which they accept and hold in common outweigh all differences that still remain. It, therefore, heartily welcomes and endorses the suggestion of the Committee that consciences should be safeguarded and long-established traditions preserved

by the exchange of a solemn pledge in the spirit of mutual trust rather than by the framing of detailed regulations.

The Council desires to affirm that it regards all this as affording manifest evidence of the guidance and blessing of Almighty God upon the labours of the Joint Committee, and to declare its confident and thankful belief that He who has led the uniting Churches thus far will continue to bless and guide them until the goal is reached to which all so earnestly desire to attain.

In this belief and hope the General Council directs its Delegates to continue their work on the Joint Committee. It makes below some statements of opinion on certain important points, and also gives instructions to its delegates with regard to certain suggestions which it desires them to convey to the Joint Committee in the belief that some of them indicate things which are essential parts of that full Catholic heritage which all desire to make their own, that others indicate things which, if accepted by all, would greatly enrich the life of the united Church, and that others again suggest ways in which some statements in the Scheme might be so modified or enlarged as to remove doubts from the minds of some and to render clearer to all the purpose and meaning of the provisions contained in it.

1. *Proposed Scheme of Union: Section III* (*A*), pp. 145, 146.

Opinion. Subject to the two Instructions given below the Council is prepared to accept the whole of the statement on Faith and Order contained in Section III (A).

Instructions. (*a*) The delegates are instructed to ask that the wording of paragraph 4 should be so modified as to bring it more into consonance with the language of this Church when it declares these two Sacraments to be 'generally necessary to salvation'.

(*b*) The delegates are instructed to endeavour to secure a rewording of the latter part of paragraph 5 so that it shall

be sufficiently clear that the unworthiness of the minister does not hinder the effect of the Sacrament.

2. *Section III (B)*, pp. 146, 147.

Opinion. Subject to the Instruction given below the Council is prepared to accept the statement upon the episcopate in the united Church contained in Section III (B).

Instruction. The attention of the delegates is called to the desirability of some redrafting of the words at the end of paragraph 1.

3. *Section III (C)*, pp. 147, 148.

Opinion. In view of the misunderstandings that have arisen and the fears that have been expressed from various sides in regard to the provisions in the Scheme for the initial ministry of the united Church, which secure to all existing ministers the continuance in that Church of their ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the Council thinks it wise to state that in heartily approving these provisions it does not intend that the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon should commit itself to the principle of the equally certain validity of all ministries; and it realizes that the Churches uniting with that Church do not demand that it should do so, and similarly it is not demanded that by accepting the limitations contained in these provisions the other uniting Churches should be considered to have endorsed any particular theory of the ministry.

4. *Section III (E)*, pp. 148, 149.

Opinion. The Council, recognizing the value of the principle of freedom in worship and sharing the desire for the development of forms of worship suited to India, is prepared to accept the provisions concerning the worship of the united Church contained in Sections III (E) and IX (A).

5. *Section IV* (*A*), p. 150.

Opinion. The Council agrees that none of the existing Churches should cease to enjoy such privileges of fellowship with other Churches as they enjoyed before the union.

In view of the fact that the full communion existing between the Anglican Churches is a fellowship of a somewhat different nature from the communion and fellowship existing between the Free Churches, the Council does not feel itself competent at this stage to decide upon the eventual corporate relationship that might exist between the united Church and other Churches. In regard to this the united Church on its part will make its own decision when the time comes.

The General Council desires to obtain the opinion of the Lambeth Conference on the whole question of inter-communion in such a situation.

6. *Section IV* (*B*), pp. 151–3.

Opinion. The Council welcomes the principle of safeguarding consciences and preserving the long-established traditions of the uniting Churches by means of mutual trust and a solemn pledge rather than by definite regulations. It is ready to endorse the pledge proposed in the present form of the Scheme in the belief that it safeguards the consciences of all members of the uniting Churches from being forced by any future administrative acts to accept during the interim period ministries and modes of worship which are definitely contrary to their long-established traditions and beliefs, and in particular provides that the rule which the Anglican Church has inherited that an episcopally ordained ministry is required for the Sacrament of Holy Communion will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule.

Instructions. (*a*) The Council instructs its delegates to explain its position as stated above to the Joint Committee,

in order that when the Scheme is finally drafted the meaning of the pledge may, in whatever manner may seem most suitable, be made plain both to those who shall hereafter be directly concerned and to others who may not be familiar with the circumstances.

(*b*) The delegates are instructed to ask that the words 'and expectation' may be omitted from the second line of IV, B 6, and that in the last line but two on that page the word 'temporary' may be substituted for the word 'such'.

7. *Section IV* (*C*), pp. 153, 154.

Opinions. (*a*) The General Council is willing to give to the Southern Dioceses of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon such autonomy as may be needed for the full development of the united Church, in the hope that further unions will be effected in the near future and that ultimately the Church of all India may be able to function as one.

At the same time it greatly desires that from the first there should be a common Consultative Council representative of the Northern Dioceses and the united Church for the discussion of common problems and the furtherance of plans for all India, and that thus should be secured the growth of that unity of thought and work which all desire.

(*b*) The General Council is bound by the Indian Church Act and Measure and the Statutory Rules to have a General Council for all India to fulfil certain legal obligations in relation to the Establishment of Chaplains, the Maintained Churches, and the Indian Church Trustees. For that purpose the dioceses of the united Church must continue to send to a General Council representatives charged with these duties and that General Council must have such authority over the affairs of the Maintained Churches as may be necessary for the discharge of those functions, and Bishops of the united Church who may be appointed to the superintendence of Maintained Churches must agree to conform

to the obligations entailed by that position, and must agree not so to act as to involve the Northern Dioceses in any conflict with the Secretary of State as to the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of the agreement contained in the Statutory Rules.

Subject to these necessary limitations the General Council agrees that it should claim no jurisdiction over the affairs of the united Church.

Instructions. (*a*) The Council instructs its delegates to consult the Joint Committee as to the possibility of combining the attendance at meetings of a General Council of representatives from the united Church, as mentioned in Opinion (*b*), with the meeting of a Consultative Council such as that suggested in Opinion (*a*).

(*b*) The delegates are instructed to emphasize the need of eliminating from the final form of the Scheme any phrase which might seem to suggest a breaking of communion between those dioceses which will be included in the united Church and the other dioceses of the present Province; and to this end to ask that the words 'absence of organic union' should not appear in this connexion.

8. *Section VI* (5), p. 158.

Opinion. The General Council considers it of great importance that the united Church should adopt as early as possible the primitive and scriptural practice of the laying on of hands with prayer for the Holy Spirit, the rite of Confirmation (not meaning thereby that the Anglican rite need be followed in detail), which was from the first considered naturally to follow Baptism and has proved of inestimable spiritual value to the Churches which have maintained it.

The Council desires that all who have been admitted to Communicant status by any of the services of admission now in use in the uniting Churches shall be recognized as communicants of the united Church and that, pending the

adoption of the rite of laying on of hands with prayer for the Holy Spirit in confirmation, such recognition of communicants shall be continued.

9. *Section VII, Part I* (*a*), pp. 158–61.

Instruction. The delegates are instructed to ask that reference be made to the authority of the Episcopal Body to publish pronouncements or instructions on matters of Faith and Order.

10. *Section VII, Part I* (*b*), pp. 161–3.

Instruction. The delegates are instructed to represent to the Joint Committee the desire of the General Council that when the election of a Bishop is confirmed by the Executive Committee, a two-thirds majority of all the Bishops entitled to vote should be required.

11. *Section VII, Part I* (*c*), pp. 163, 164.

Instruction. The delegates are instructed to inform the Joint Committee that the Council desires to see included among the duties of Presbyters that of seeking to bring sinners to repentance and forgiveness through the ministry of reconciliation.

12. *Section IX* (*B*), pp. 174, 175.

Instruction. The delegates are instructed to suggest to the Joint Committee that paragraph (5) on page 175 be redrafted to run as follows:

'*The Thanksgiving* for God's glory and goodness and the redemptive work of Christ in His birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, leading on to a reference to His institution of the Sacrament, in which His own words are rehearsed, and to the setting apart of the bread and wine to be used for the purpose of the Sacrament with prayer that we may receive thereby that which our Lord intends to give us in this Sacrament'.

144. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work

THE MESSAGE OF THE CONFERENCE

STOCKHOLM, AUGUST 29, 1925

I

1. The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, assembled at Stockholm from August 19 to 30, 1925, and composed of representatives of the greater number of Christian communions coming from thirty-seven nations of the Old and New Worlds, and of the Near and Far East, sends this brotherly message to all followers of Christ, beseeching them to join with them in prayer, confession, thanksgiving, study, and service. We regret that not all Christian communions have found it possible to accept our invitation, for in view of the vital and far-reaching issues with which we have been concerned, we cannot but hope for that co-operation of all parts of the Church of Christ without which its testimony and influence in the world must be incomplete.

2. For five years men and women have planned and prayed that this Conference might be held. Other efforts for closer relations between the Churches have prepared the way. But this has proved the most signal instance of fellowship and co-operation, across the boundaries of nations and confessions, which the world has yet seen. The sins and sorrows, the struggles and losses of the Great War and since, have compelled the Christian Churches to recognize, humbly and with shame, that 'the world is too strong for a divided Church'. Leaving for the time our differences in Faith and Order, our aim has been to secure united practical action in Christian Life and Work. The Conference itself is a conspicuous fact. But it is only a beginning.

3. We confess before God and the world the sins and

failures of which the Churches have been guilty, through lack of love and sympathetic understanding. Loyal seekers after truth and righteousness have been kept away from Christ, because His followers have so imperfectly represented Him to mankind. The call of the present hour to the Church should be repentance, and with repentance a new courage springing from the inexhaustible resources which are in Christ.

4. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that in the plan of God and through the guidance of His Spirit the representatives of so many Christian communions have been led to assemble and have renewed in common fellowship their faith, hope, and love in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that in spite of differences, sincere and profound, they have been enabled to discuss so many difficult problems with a candour, a charity, and a self-restraint, which the Spirit of God alone could inspire. As we repeated the Lord's Prayer together, each in the speech his mother taught him, we realized afresh our common faith, and experienced as never before the unity of the Church of Christ.

II

5. The Conference has deepened and purified our devotion to the Captain of our Salvation. Responding to His call, 'Follow Me', we have in the presence of the Cross accepted the urgent duty of applying His Gospel in all realms of human life—industrial, social, political, and international.

6. Thus in the sphere of economics we have declared that the soul is the supreme value, that it must not be subordinated to the rights of property or to the mechanism of industry, and that it may claim as its first right the right of salvation. Therefore we contend for the free and full development of the human personality. In the name of the Gospel we have affirmed that industry should not be based

solely on the desire for individual profit, but that it should be conducted for the service of the community. Property should be regarded as a stewardship for which an account must be given to God. Co-operation between capital and labour should take the place of conflict, so that employers and employed alike may be enabled to regard their part in industry as the fulfilment of a vocation. Thus alone can we obey our Lord's command, to do unto others even as we would they should do unto us.

7. In the realm of social morality we considered the problems presented by overcrowding, unemployment, laxity of morals, drink and its evils, crime and the criminal. Here we were led to recognize that these problems are so grave that they cannot be solved by individual effort alone, but that the community must accept responsibility for them, and must exercise such social control over individual action as in each instance may be necessary for the common good. We have not neglected the more intimate questions which a higher appreciation of personality raises in the domain of education, the family and the vocation, questions which affect woman, the child, and the worker. The Church must contend not for the rights of the individual as such, but for the rights of the moral personality, since all mankind is enriched by the full unfolding of even a single soul.

8. We have also set forth the guiding principles of a Christian internationalism, equally opposed to a national bigotry and a weak cosmopolitanism. We have affirmed the universal character of the Church, and its duty to preach and practise the love of the brethren. We have considered the relation of the individual conscience to the state. We have examined the race problem, the subject of law and arbitration, and the constitution of an international order which would provide peaceable methods for removing the causes of war—questions which in the tragic conditions of

to-day make so deep an appeal to our hearts. We summon the Churches to share with us our sense of the horror of war, and of its futility as a means of settling international disputes, and to pray and work for the fulfilment of the promise that under the sceptre of the Prince of Peace, 'mercy and truth shall meet together, righteousness and peace shall kiss each other'.

9. We have not attempted to offer precise solutions, nor have we confirmed by a vote the results of our friendly discussions. This was due not only to our respect for the convictions of individuals or groups, but still more to the feeling that the mission of the Church is above all to state principles, and to assert the ideal, while leaving to individual consciences and to communities the duty of applying them with charity, wisdom, and courage.

III

10. If this goal is to be attained we recognize the pressing need of education. The individual must be educated by the Church, so that he may be enabled to exercise a Christian discernment in all things. The Churches must educate themselves by study, conference, and prayer, so that being led by the Spirit of Truth into all truth, they may be enabled in increasing measure to apprehend the mind of Christ. We recognize that the root of evil is to be found in the human will, and we therefore desire to re-emphasize our conviction that this will must be surrendered to the high and holy will of God, whose service is perfect freedom. Even Christian ideas and ideals cannot save the world if separated from their personal source in the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and unless themselves taken up into the personal life of the believer.

11. To this end we address our appeal first to all Christians. Let each man, following his own conscience, and putting his convictions to the test of practical life, accept his full

personal responsibility for the doing of God's Will on earth as it is in heaven, and in working for God's Kingdom. Let him in entire loyalty to his own Church seek to have a share in that wider fellowship and co-operation of the Christian Churches of which this Conference is a promise and pledge. In the name of this wider fellowship we would send a special message of sympathy to all those who amid circumstances of persecution and trial are fulfilling their Christian calling, and we would comfort them with the thought that they are thus brought into fellowship with the sufferings of Christ.

12. But we cannot confine this appeal to the Churches, for we gratefully recognize that now we have many allies in this holy cause.

We turn to the young of all countries. With keen appreciation we have heard of their aspirations and efforts for a better social order as expressed in the youth movements of many lands. We desire to enlist the ardour and energy of youth, the freshness and the fullness of their life, in the service of the Kingdom of God and of humanity.

We think also of those who are seeking after truth, by whatever way, and ask their help. As Christ is the Truth, so Christ's Church heartily welcomes every advance of reason and conscience among men. Particularly we would invite the co-operation of those teachers and scholars who in many realms possess the influence and command the knowledge without which the solution of our pressing practical problems is impossible.

In the name of the Son of Man, the Carpenter of Nazareth, we send this message to the workers of the world. We thankfully record the fact that at present even under difficult conditions a multitude of workers in the different countries are acting in accordance with these principles. We deplore the causes of misunderstanding and estrangement which still exist and are determined to do our part to remove them. We share their aspirations after a just and fraternal social

order, through which the opportunity shall be assured for the development, according to God's design, of the full manhood of every man.

13. We have said that this Conference is only a beginning. We cannot part without making some provision for the carrying on of our work. We have therefore decided to form a Continuation Committee to follow up what has been begun, to consider how effect can be given to the suggestions which have been made, to examine the practicability of calling another such Conference at a future date, and in particular to take steps for that further study of difficult problems and that further education of ourselves and of our churches, on which all wise judgement and action must be based. May we not hope that through the work of this body, and through the increasing fellowship and co-operation of the Christians of all nations in the one Spirit, our oneness in Christ may be more and more revealed to the world in Life and Work?

14. Only as we become inwardly one shall we attain real unity of mind and spirit. The nearer we draw to the Crucified, the nearer we come to one another, in however varied colours the Light of the World may be reflected in our faith. Under the Cross of Jesus Christ we reach out hands to one another. The Good Shepherd had to die in order that he might gather together the scattered children of God. In the Crucified and Risen Lord alone lies the world's hope.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

DATE DUE

FEB 15 1996			
JAN 16 1996			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.

BX
8
A1D6
v.2

18838

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

GTU Library
3 2400 00303 9397